

# Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy

---

## Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

---

You Said We Did - Consultation Report  
April 2020

## Contents

1. About the RAMS .....	1
Background context .....	1
Development of the strategy .....	1
A flexible approach to mitigation .....	2
Monitoring and review process .....	2
2. Introduction .....	3
3. Consultation.....	3
Who was consulted?.....	4
How did we consult?.....	4
4. Consultation comments .....	5
5. The main issues raised.....	5
6. Proposed amendments to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) .....	8
7. Detailed summaries of the comments received .....	9

## Tables

Table 1 – Main issues raised.....	6
Table 2 – Schedule of amendments to the SPD .....	8
Table 3 – Section One: Summary of consultation responses and actions.....	11
Table 4 – Section Two: Summary of consultation responses and actions.....	24
Table 5 – Section Three: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	36
Table 6 – Section Four: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	47
Table 7 – Section Five: Summary of consultation responses and actions.....	65
Table 8 – Section Six: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	74
Table 9 – Section Seven: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	84
Table 10 – Section Eight: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	90
Table 11 – Section Nine: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	95
Table 12 – Section Ten: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	99
Table 13 – Appendix One: Summary of consultation responses and actions.....	102
Table 14 – Appendix 2: Summary of consultation responses and actions .....	111
Table 15 – Other Comments: Summary of consultation responses and actions ....	115

## Glossary

Appropriate Assessment	Forms part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment
Competent Authority	Has the invested or delegated authority to perform a designated function.
England Coast Path	Natural England are implementing the Government scheme to create a new national route around the coast of England
Impact Risk Zone	Developed by Natural England to make a rapid initial assessment of the potential risks posed by development proposals. They cover areas such as SSSIs, SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites.
Habitats sites	Includes SPA, SAC & Ramsar sites as defined by NPPF (2018). Includes SPAs and SACs which are designated under European laws (the 'Habitats Directive' and 'Birds Directive' respectively) to protect Europe's rich variety of wildlife and habitats. Together, SPAs and SACs make up a series of sites across Europe, referred to collectively as Natura 2000 sites. In the UK they are commonly known as European sites; the National Planning Policy Framework also applies the same protection measures for Ramsar sites (Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention) as those in place for European sites.
Habitats Regulations Assessment	Considers the impacts of plans and proposed developments on Natura 2000 sites.
Natural England	Natural England - the statutory adviser to government on the natural environment in England.
Local Planning Authority	The public authority whose duty it is to carry out specific planning functions for a particular area.
Ramsar site	Wetland of international importance designated under the Ramsar Convention 1979.
Special Area of Conservation	Land designated under Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora.
Special Protection Area	Land classified under Directive 79/409 on the Conservation of Wild Birds.
Supplementary Planning Document	A document that provides further detail to the Local Plan. Capable of being a material consideration but are not part of the development plan.
Zone of Influence	The Zone of Influence identifies the distance within which new residents are likely to travel to the Essex coast Habitats sites for recreation.

## Acronyms

AA	Appropriate Assessment
GPDO	General Permitted Development Order
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment
LPA	Local Planning Authority
RAMS	Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
UU	Unilateral undertaking
ZoI	Zone of Influence

## 1. About the RAMS

### Background context

- 1.1 The Essex Coast RAMS was initiated by Natural England, the government's adviser for the natural environment in England, in 2017. Natural England identified the habitats sites and local planning authorities that should be involved in the Essex Coast RAMS based on existing evidence of visitor pressure. Essex County Council provides an advisory role but are not one of the RAMS local authority partners.
- 1.2 The Essex Coast is rich and diverse and has many protected habitats sites (also referred to as European sites and Natura 2000 sites). These sites are protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017). Joint working offers the opportunity to protect the Essex Coast from increased recreational disturbance as a result of new housing across Essex. Likely significant effects to habitats sites from non-residential development will be considered, through Habitat Regulations Assessments, on a case by case basis by the relevant local planning authority in consultation with Natural England. A Habitat Regulations Assessment has been/ will be completed for each of the projects that form part of the England Coastal Path.
- 1.3 There are numerous examples elsewhere around the country of mitigation strategies that avoid and mitigate the impacts of recreational disturbance on habitats sites, such as Bird Aware Solent, Bird Wise North Kent and Thames Basin Heaths. This is a new and growing area in the conservation community and those working on mitigation strategies regularly share good practice and assist each other.
- 1.4 Visitor surveys were carried out at key locations within each of the Habitats sites. Zones of Influence (Zol) were calculated for each habitats site using the survey data and these are used to trigger developer contributions for the delivery of avoidance and mitigation measures.

### Development of the strategy

- 1.5 The Essex Coast RAMS Strategy Document was completed in January 2019. Natural England provided advice throughout the preparation of the Essex Coast RAMS and 'signed off' the RAMS Strategy Document before it was finalised and adopted by local planning authorities. The local planning authority partners are collecting RAMS contributions for development within the Zone of Influence (Zol), which will be spent on the mitigation measures package detailed in the RAMS Strategy Document. Mitigation measures are listed as: immediate, shorter to medium term, and longer-term projects. A contingency is included and an in-perpetuity fund will be established. The first measure is staff resources: The Delivery Officer and then two rangers.

- 1.6 Through the provision of a per dwelling tariff, the RAMS enables the achievement of proportionate mitigation measures and enables development proposals of all scales to contribute to necessary mitigation. The RAMS is fully funded by developer contributions.
- 1.7 During development of the Strategy Document workshops were held with key stakeholders with local and specialised knowledge to capture the mitigation measures considered as most effective to avoid the impacts likely to result from increased recreational pressure.

### **A flexible approach to mitigation**

- 1.8 The costed mitigation package (Table 8.2 of the RAMS Strategy Document) includes an effective mix of measures considered necessary to avoid likely disturbance at key locations with easy public access. The package is flexible and deliverable and based on best practice elsewhere in England. A precautionary approach has been adopted, with priority areas for measures identified as those which have breeding SPA birds which could conflict with high numbers of summer visitors to the coast and those with important roosts and foraging areas in the winter. Sensitive habitats have also been identified for ranger visits. The mitigation package prioritises measures considered to be effective at avoiding or mitigating recreational disturbance by habitats sites managers. For example, Maldon District Council are managing water sports on the Blackwater estuary. Encouraging responsible recreation is a key measure endorsed by land managers of important wildlife sites across the country, including Natural England, RSPB and the wildlife trusts. These bodies regularly provide educational material at sites to encourage visitors to comply with key objectives.
- 1.9 The RAMS is intended to be a flexible project that can adapt quickly as necessary. The rangers will quickly become familiar with the sites and areas that are particularly sensitive, which may change over time, and sites that experience a high number of visitors. The rangers on the ground experience will steer the project and necessary measures.

### **Monitoring and review process**

- 1.10 The Essex Coast RAMS will provide a flexible and responsive approach, allowing it to respond to unforeseen issues. Close engagement will continue with Natural England who will be able to advise if recreational disturbance is increasing at particular habitats sites and specific locations. Thus, enabling these locations to be targeted by the rangers to have an immediate impact. Updated visitor surveys, which are included in the mitigation package, will enable ZoI to be reviewed and expanded if it is shown that visitors are travelling further than previously found. There is scope to adjust the tariff too if it is shown that contributions are not covering the identified measures, if the ZoI is made smaller or to respond to changes in housing numbers across Essex.

- 1.11 The Essex Coast RAMS will be monitored and reviewed on a regular basis by the RAMS project staff. The Essex Coast RAMS will be deemed successful if the level of bird and habitat disturbance is not increased despite an increase in population and the number of visitors to the coastal sites for recreation (paragraph 1.7 of RAMS). The baseline has been identified in the RAMS Strategy Document and will be used to assess the effectiveness of the RAMS.
- 1.12 The effectiveness of the Essex Coast RAMS has been considered/examined as part of Chelmsford City Council's Local Plan Examination. Chelmsford City Council's Local Plan Inspector's Report states that: *“Overall, the HRA concludes that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of European protected sites, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects, subject to the mitigation set out in the Plan policies. Natural England agrees with these conclusions and I have no substantive evidence to counter these findings. The requirement to undertake an appropriate assessment in accordance with the Regulations has therefore been met.”* The mitigation set out in the Plan policies includes reference to the Essex Coast RAMS. The Inspector states that it is necessary to incorporate RAMS into strategic policies to ensure that all relevant development within the Zol contribute accordingly and reference to RAMS should be incorporated into several site allocation policies. These modifications will be incorporated into the adopted Local Plan.

## 2. Introduction

- 2.1 The Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) focuses on the mitigation that is necessary to protect the wildlife of the Essex coast from the increased visitor pressure associated with new residential development in-combination with other plans and projects, and how this mitigation will be funded.
- 2.2 The SPD has been produced by a total of 12 Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) in Essex, which are partners in and responsible for the delivery of the RAMS. These partner LPAs are listed below:

- Basildon Borough Council
- Braintree District Council
- Brentwood Borough Council
- Castle Point Borough Council
- Chelmsford City Council
- Colchester Borough Council
- Maldon District Council
- Rochford District Council
- Southend Borough Council
- Tendring District Council
- Thurrock Borough Council
- Uttlesford District Council

## 3. Consultation

- 3.1 A draft SPD was published for consultation between Friday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2020 and Friday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2020 in accordance with the planning consultation requirements of each LPA.



- 3.2 These consultation requirements require the publication of a 'You Said We Did' report, which outlines details on who and how the public, organisations and bodies were consulted, the number of people, organisations and stakeholders who submitted comments, a summary of the main issues raised in the comments received, and the proposed amendments to the SPD that the LPAs intend to make in response to them.
- 3.3 Following the close of the consultation all comments have been considered and the main issues summarised within Section 4 of this report. Where amendments have been deemed necessary as a result of any main issues, these will be factored into a new iteration of SPD, prior to its adoption by each LPA. These amendments are set out in Section 5 of this report.

### **Who was consulted?**

- 3.4 The consultation was undertaken jointly by the 12 Councils and hosted by Essex County Council. The 12 Councils consulted the following bodies and persons:
- Statutory bodies including neighbouring Councils, local Parish and Town Councils, utility companies, health representatives and Government bodies such as Highways England, Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency;
  - Local stakeholders including the Business Forums, Essex Wildlife Trust, Sport England, and the Police;
  - Developers and landowner and their agents;
  - Local businesses, voluntary and community groups, and
  - The public.
- 3.5 For more details on the bodies consulted please contact the relevant partner Council.

### **How did we consult?**

- 3.6 The consultation was available to view and comment on the Essex County Council Citizen Space consultation portal during the consultation dates. The consultation material was also available to view on partner Council's websites, from their main offices and at a number of local public libraries. Information was also provided on the project Bird Aware website [www.essexcoast.birdaware.org](http://www.essexcoast.birdaware.org)

- 3.7 For those who do not have access to computers, paper response forms were made available.
- 3.8 The Councils sent direct emails/letter notifications to all consultees registered on their Local Plan consultation databases. A public notice was also included in the Essex Chronicle to advise how to respond and the consultation dates and information on the consultation was also posted on social media.

#### **4. Consultation comments**

4.1 The Essex Coast RAMS draft SPD consultation received a total of 146 comments, 87 of these being from Essex residents and 59 being from various organisations. All the comments received can be viewed in full on Essex County Council's Consultation Portal at **XXXX**.

4.2 Of the resident responses, the following numbers of responses were received from individual administrative areas:

- 21 were made from residents of Chelmsford;
- 18 were made from residents of Tendring;
- 16 were made from residents of Basildon;
- 14 were made from residents of Braintree;
- 12 were made from residents of Rochford;
- 11 were made from residents of Colchester;
- 8 were made from residents of Maldon;
- 6 were made from residents of Uttlesford;
- 2 were made from residents of Brentwood;
- 2 were made from residents of Castle Point;
- 2 were made from residents of Southend-on-Sea; and
- 0 were made from residents of Thurrock.

#### **5. The main issues raised**

5.1 Comments were received on a wide range of themes, relating to the SPD, the RAMS itself and also the format of the consultation exercise.

- 5.2 A number of themes emerge through reviewing the comments received. These themes respond to those comments that were made by a number of respondents, or otherwise pointed out areas of improvement for the SPD as consulted upon.
- 5.3 Table 1 below sets out the main issues received during the consultation and a response by the LPAs on each issue. A summary of all representations received is included later in this report.

**Table 1 – Main issues raised**

<b>Main issues raised</b>
<b>Confusion about the purpose and aims of the RAMS</b> – including the need for jargon and acronyms to be explained; the SPD to cover all wildlife on the coast not just birds and to also address sea level rises and coastal erosion caused by climate change; confusion regarding the role of Essex County Council in implementing RAMS; confusion over who pays the tariff; and that mitigation payments should be ring fenced towards care for people not wildlife.
<b>Scope and detail of mitigation measures</b> – only relevant and necessary mitigation should be provided, based upon the scale of the proposal, its use and the site context, to accord with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. SPD could also provide some examples of physical mitigation measures, for instance prevention of powered water sports or exclusions for wind powered watersports, and restrictions on off-lead dogs near areas known for ground nesting birds.
<b>Concern regarding the effectiveness of the RAMS approach</b> – concerns include it's an overly bureaucratic process to collect small sums, there is a lack of scientific evidence to demonstrate provision of alternative green space will detract from visits to SPA/Ramsar sites; question deliverability of mitigation, question provision for enforcement of tariff collection.
<b>Query whether key stakeholders have been involved in the RAMS</b> - including Essex Wildlife Trust, RSPB, Bug Life, Woodland Trust, National Trust, CPRE, British Trust for Ornithology, and local ornithology groups.
<b>Will habitats sites continue to be protected as a result of Brexit?</b>
<b>The RAMS will allow inappropriate development</b> – RAMS will allow harmful development to proceed; will fast track planning applications; no control or scrutiny of cumulative impact of smaller planning applications; does not consider development outside Zones of Influence; total avoidance of disturbance should be an option; should be no more building in Essex, and none on or adjacent to important coastal wildlife sites.
<b>Money should be spent on other projects</b> - funding should not be taken away from essential services to fund the strategy.

**Main issues raised**

**Concern with the Zones of Influence** – regarded by some as too small and by others as too big; also the zoned tariff should be based upon the number of Zones of Influence a site is within and the distance it is away from the Zone of Influence should be applied. In addition, the mapped Zones of Influence for the Blackwater Estuary, Stour Estuary and Hamford Water stretch into the Suffolk Coast RAMS area. This could be confusing for developers of new dwellings in south Suffolk, as it implies that a contribution is required to the Essex Coast RAMS, in addition to the Suffolk Coast RAMS.

**The tariff is set too high, or alternatively too low** – e.g. not realistic, should be based on a percentage of the purchase price of a property. Also considered that the number of dwellings which are currently identified to be built over Local Plan Periods until 2038 does not accurately reflect the number which will actually come forward, so the contributions collected would exceed the overall cost for the mitigation package. Tariff should also reflect the size of the dwelling so that more is paid for larger dwellings. All authorities must also test the level of contribution, alongside all their policy requirements contained in their Local Plans to ensure that the contributions are viable.

**Adequacy of proposed budget and staff to deliver project across such a wide area** – staff level and costs are too low; alternative view is that funding for personnel is excessive and the work duplicates that of other stakeholders. Also unclear what assumptions have been made in respect of overheads on top of salary costs for the staff identified as being needed.

**Concerns about monitoring (the tariff and Zones of Influence)** – monitoring should be more frequent.

**Other land uses should come within the scope of the tariff** - including tourist accommodation and caravan parks/chalets, airport related development, other commercial development.

**Perceived conflict of RAMS purpose and aims with the England Coastal Path project which will increase access to the coast, and existing and future strategies for tourists and residents to access and enjoy the coast, for economic growth and health and wellbeing.**

**Alternative to paying into the RAMS should not be allowed, or if it is the process should be clarified** - developers may use this alternative as a way of avoiding the payments without showing any real commitment to the alternative. If allowed, the SPD would be more effective if it clearly set out the process for agreeing bespoke mitigation for strategic sites.

## 6. Proposed amendments to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

6.1 In response to the main issues summarised in Section 5, this report sets out a number of amendments that will be forthcoming in a new iteration of the SPD. These amendments have been agreed by all of the partner LPAs. The following table outlines this schedule of changes.

**Table 2 – Schedule of amendments to the SPD**

Amendment	
1	A glossary and list of acronyms and a description of what they mean is included within the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD); however, it is proposed that the Glossary and Acronym sections are moved to the beginning of the SPD. Further amendments to expand the Glossary and list of Acronyms included within these Sections to reflect all of those used in the SPD, RAMS and supporting documents.
2	Amendments clearly setting out how overheads and other costs have been identified within the RAMS mitigation package are proposed within the SPD.
3	The first paragraph of the SPD will be amended to state 'birds and their habitats' rather than 'Wildlife' to make it clearer from the outset as to what wildlife the RAMS and the SPD seek to protect.
4	Once approved the South East Marine Plan as well as the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans will become part of the Development Plan for the relevant LPAs. An amendment to recognise these Plans, and their policies, within the SPD is proposed.
5	An amendment to include fishing / bait digging to paragraph 2.2 is proposed.
6	An amendment to refer to the 'Outer Thames Estuary SPA' rather than the 'Thames Estuary SPA' is proposed.
7	Amendments to replace existing maps with higher resolution images are proposed.
8	An amendment introducing additional clarification within Paragraph 3.7 is proposed. This will ensure that the SPD is more explicit regarding proposals for single dwellings being subject to the RAMS tariff.
9	An amendment to the SPD setting out the requirements of development proposals in regard to statutory HRA procedures and on-site mitigation, and the specific effects the RAMS will mitigate in accordance with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations, is proposed.

Amendment	
10	An amendment justifying the inclusion of C2 Residential Institutions and C2A Secure Residential Institutions as qualifying within the scope of tariff payments is proposed.
11	Within the 'useful links' section, an amendment to include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is proposed.
12	It is proposed that the SPD is amended to refer to set out that all non-residential proposals are exempt from the tariff.
13	It is proposed that the map in Appendix 2 of the Essex Coast RAMS SPD SEA/HRA Screening Report be amended to reference the Outer Thames SPA designation.
14	Amendments are proposed that reiterate the requirement for project-level HRA/AA of development proposals which will explore the hierarchy of avoidance and mitigation, and that the SPD is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects only.
15	Amendments are proposed to the SPD and the Essex Coast RAMS SPD SEA/HRA Screening Report to clearly set out that the intention of Essex Coast RAMS mitigation to enable the conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the international designated sites.
16	An amendment to the relevant map in the SPD and RAMS is proposed, which will remove all areas of Suffolk from the Zone of Influence.
17	It is proposed that an amendment explaining more clearly the relationship between the effects of a population increase resulting from net new dwelling increases is included within the SPD.
18	An amendment is proposed to include all measurements in miles as well as kilometres.

## 7. Detailed summaries of the comments received

7.1 Tables 3 to 13 of this report shows a summary of the comments received during the consultation on the Essex Coast RAMS draft SPD. The summaries do not seek to identify all the issues raised in the representations. These tables however show:

- The name and type (resident / organisation) of each respondent;
- A summary of the main issues raised in the comments per Section of the draft SPD; and

- The LPAs' response to each main issue and whether actions and / or amendments are considered necessary as a result.

7.2 A number of respondents suggest ideas for how to better manage visitors to the Essex coast e.g. keep dog on leads, fencing, restore Oyster reefs. These will be reviewed by the project Delivery Officer and Rangers once they are appointed and have not been specifically responded to in tables 3 to 13.



**Section One - Introduction**

**Table 3 – Section One: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	There should be no use of acronyms in the Report.	A list of acronyms and a description of what they mean is included within the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It is however proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
2	Mr Alan Hardy	Resident	I believe there is a need for clear policies and regulation and the whole document seems to take that approach. Future policy must support and enhance all Government and legal policies already existing and where necessary provide greater protection than required by statute. I think there should be greater reference to flood risk, management and mitigation and how this can impact or be integrated into recreational use and habitat protection.	The SPD is related only to those 'in-combination' recreational impacts identified through the Local Planning Authorities' (LPAs) Local Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Frances Coulsen	Resident	No comments as this Section seems to set out the facts.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Amy Gardner-Carr	Resident	The building of homes is the threat to the natural habitat. The suggestion of a tariff for avoidance is ridiculous in the face of mounting and current evidence that destruction of habitat is having disastrous effects on wildlife. Move the builds to somewhere else, not the habitats.	The SPD is related only to 'in-combination' recreational impacts and not habitat loss. No amendment proposed.
5	Mr Brian Springall	Resident	Before protecting wildlife, the Council needs to get its housing development plans sorted & improve the district's infrastructure i.e. roads, flood protection etc.	The need for the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) and the SPD stems from planned growth. Local Plans have been prepared or are in preparation and set out the housing need and infrastructure requirements for each Council area. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
6	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	No comments. It's an introduction and no information is given, other than to outline how you have set out the sections, and in what format you have set out the document.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
7	Mr Brian Mills	Resident	Cannot see any contingency for enforcement or punitive action, if required results are not obtained / maintained.	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying proposals, or if suitable mitigation is not provided, then planning permission should not be given. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	I don't think £8.9 million is enough to cover mitigation over such a long time period. Developers could and should contribute far more than £122.30 per dwelling. I do not believe that this is sufficient funding to fully mitigate the effects of new housing on the Essex coast.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that will be used to fund mitigation related to 'in-combination' recreational effects only. The tariff is 'evidence based' and has been calculated by dividing the cost of the RAMS mitigation package by the number of dwellings (housing growth) proposed in LPA Local Plans. The tariff will be subject to review during the life of the RAMS project. Other mechanisms and requirements exist outside the scope of the SPD for other required and related mitigation. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr Nigel Whitehouse	Wildlife Defenders	We believe we need to protect all wildlife on our coast not just birds. Protected areas for wildlife should be provided.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast in relation to birds. Other forms of mitigation addressing any effects on other designations across Essex are not within the specific scope of the SPD. The first paragraph of the SPD will be amended to state 'birds and their habitats' rather than 'Wildlife'

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				to make it clearer from the outset as to what wildlife the RAMS and the SPD seek to protect.
10	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Documents and plans are paper, and it is only man power that will make any positive outcome for wildlife, wherever it manages to survive. The only change necessary is to stop building on Green Belt, as it acts as rich habitats and has benefit to humans. It is vital that building on flood plains is stopped. There is a need to stop ignoring local advice and knowledge.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast. The tariff is proposed to fund a RAMS Delivery Officer and Rangers. Other forms of mitigation addressing effects on other designations across Essex are not within the specific scope of the SPD. The distribution of new development growth is a matter for individual LPAs through their Local Plans. No amendment proposed. Not all of Essex is within the Green Belt.
11	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	I agree that changes are necessary although I don't quite follow the costs broken down in Appendix 2.1. The cost of a delivery officer at £45k seems very high and the cost of a ranger at £36k is also high. I am also questioning the table which shows for year 2 - one ranger then on the next line year 2 one ranger again. So is the suggestion we recruit 2 rangers at year 2, or is there a mistake in the table whereby this line has been duplicated?	The mitigation package 'total costs' for the Delivery Officer and Rangers include the salary cost and necessary overheads. Amendments clearly setting out how overheads and other costs have been identified within the RAMS mitigation package are proposed within the SPD. A total of three Rangers are proposed in the mitigation package: two for Year 2 and one additional ranger from Year 5. No amendment proposed.
12	Ms Rachel Cross	Resident	What are the aims of the SPD? Have the Essex Wildlife Trust, RSPB, Bug Life, Woodland Trust, National Trust, CPRE, British Trust for Ornithology, Local ornithology groups and SSSI councils been involved or consulted? How have other areas like Pembrokeshire approached this? Has the local	The SPD sets out a mechanism for funding mitigation, which is outlined in more detail in the RAMS document, a link to which was provided as part of this consultation. The approach is

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			government association got some best practice examples to benchmark against?	similar to other strategies across the country as endorsed by Natural England; a common stakeholder regarding Habitats Sites. Various groups have been invited to respond to this consultation including Essex Wildlife Trust (EWT) and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). Amendments proposed to the SPD in response to the comments received are set out in Section 5 of this Report.
13	Ms Caroline Macgregor	Brightlingsea village councillor	I believe that developer contributions should be more per dwelling to offset the costs of protecting wildlife. I also believe protected areas should be extended.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Protecting wildlife from development is and can be ensured and funded through other mechanisms. The extension of protected areas is not within the scope of the RAMS or the SPD. No amendment proposed.
14	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	Planners do not necessarily have the appropriate knowledge about understanding the type of habitat required for wading wildfowl. The RSPB must be consulted on every application. If wetland wildfowl are disturbed, they will not return.	The Essex Coast RAMS has been devised and will be managed by specialist ecologists and proposes strategic mitigation regarding in-combination recreational effects only. Habitat creation forms part of the mitigation package, and the Strategy and SPD recognise that there will be a need to work with landowners and the Environment Agency. The RSPB are consulted on relevant planning

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				applications in line with LPA procedures. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Peter Dervin	Resident	Funding should not be taken away from essential services to fund this.	The funds collected will not take any funding away from essential services. The RAMS funding will help support critical environmental services and initiatives along the Essex Coast. No amendment proposed.
16	Mr Neil Hargreaves	Resident	<p>I am uneasy with creating or extending yet another bureaucracy. This one to collect very small sums from new housing developments, in our case some way from the coast. This is hypothecation which normally is frowned on, because among other things it requires a heavy admin cost. I think these things should be properly funded at a national level. It needs a continuing funding from all of us not one-off payments from landowners / developers with no certainty of income stream and 99.9% of the nation not contributing.</p> <p>And what about the reverse? New developments near the coast will burden for example Stansted Airport. On this same principle Uttlesford should receive payment to mitigate the impacts of surrounding development on our area.</p> <p>Perhaps we should be contributing towards marine conservation?</p>	The Zone of Influence has been justified through visitor surveys at the Essex Coast, determining that existing residents within it travel to the Essex Coast for recreation. The SPD is required to fund the mitigation required of the effects from future housing growth within the Zone of Influence, and it is considered appropriate that these are paid for through a planning contribution. The impacts of development in Uttlesford are a matter for the Uttlesford local plan No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	The Section is clear enough, except the use of jargon is likely to deter people.	Noted. Where technical terminology and acronyms are used, these are defined in the SPD. Efforts have been made to ensure that the SPD is clear, minimises the use of jargon. An abbreviations list is also provided. No amendment proposed.
18	Dr John L Victory	Resident	The proposed England Coastal Path will directly affect these areas and should be highlighted in this process of mitigation. Consultation with interested bodies must include that of the Essex Local Access Forum - a	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Members

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			statutory body that advises authorities on strategy for Public Rights of Way.	of the Essex Local Access Forum were consulted where they appear on LPA databases. No amendment required.
19	Mr Andrew Whiteley	Resident	I would like to see less focus on developers' requirements and more focus on Essex residents, wildlife, climate impact and infrastructure support.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Local Plans are dealing with the other impacts of new development. No amendment required.
20	Mr Peter Bates	Resident	No changes required.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	The document is not written in plain English and is confusing to the reader, especially those not aware of jargon and specific language used. This document is not written with the entire residents of the area in mind and excludes many who would benefit from inclusion, many of whom would be users of the coastal areas supporting wildlife.	Noted. Where technical terminology and acronyms are used, these are defined in a glossary. Efforts have been made to ensure that the SPD is clear, minimises the use of jargon. An abbreviations list is also provided. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr Graham Womack	Resident	<p>It is unclear what other 'plan and projects' (in addition to residential developments) are to be considered as within the scope. The Essex County Council's Green Space Strategy (2019), encouraged organisations responsible for managing wildlife sites to become self-funding through commercial activities provided at their sites. This is likely to increase the footfall at these sites (including those on the coast), even before new developments are considered.</p> <p>Has any work been done to estimate the expected visitor numbers to the Essex coast- both now and for future years?</p>	The Essex Coast RAMS has been developed in response to the recommendations of each partner LPA's HRA/AA work for their emerging or adopted Local Plans. These HRA/AAs set out those other plans and projects that in combination with the Local Plans may have effects on recreational disturbance at the Essex Coast. The Essex Coast RAMS process began with visitor surveys and counts at the Essex Coast to determine the extent of the Zone of Influence. No amendments are proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
23	Mr Kevin Smith	Resident	The Geese overwintering on Hanford Water appear to be greatly reduced this year (2019/20); this would be to wild-fowlers rather than local development, this seems to be too narrow minded to easily blame developers.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only on the Essex Coast. The SPD therefore, does not blame the developers, but assesses the impact of increased visitors to the coast as a result of increased population within most of Essex. No amendment proposed.
24	Mrs Anne Clitheroe	Essex County Council	Essex County Council is satisfied with the content of the Essex Coast RAMS SPD and confirms that it wishes to continue to be engaged in this process.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
25	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	It was difficult to locate the RAMS which needed better signposting.	Noted. The RAMS was available as a supporting document during the consultation period and is available at <a href="https://essexcoast.birdaware.org/home">https://essexcoast.birdaware.org/home</a> . No amendment proposed.
26	Mr Mark East	Resident	I do not consider that the proposals in the first instance avoid harm. It appears that the strategy is to fast track planning applications and there is insufficient evidence that alternative site allocation for development outside of the Zone of Influence has been considered. On the contrary it is clear that proposals tend to concentrate development within the Zone of Influence. I believe the intent of the author(s) of the legislation are to avoid harm and if it can't be avoided then to move to mitigation and finally compensate. It is understood that English High Court's ruling that mitigation was acceptable without consideration of avoidance was over-ruled by the ECJ.	The SPD does not promote fast tracking planning applications and makes little difference to the speed of applications or prioritising applications for developments which make a contribution. The impact on habitats is one of many considerations in determining planning applications, and agreement to pay the contribution does not mean that an application will be granted if other factors mean it should be refused. The consideration of alternative site allocation outside of the Zone of Influence represents Stage 3 of the HRA process and if deemed necessary would be applicable to the

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				HRAs of the LPAs' Local Plans. The HRAs of the LPAs' Local Plans all considered, at Stage 2 of that process (AA), that mitigation is possible to ensure that development proposals would not have any in-combination recreational effects on the Essex Coast's Habitats Sites. The RAMS exists to set out that mitigation, and the approach has been endorsed by Natural England as the relevant statutory authority. As such, there was no need for any of the Local Plans to progress to Stage 3 of the HRA process. No amendment proposed.
27	Mrs Michelle Endsor	Resident	Mitigation is purely speculative and unproven. The expansion of London Southend Airport with its added noise and pollution has already done untold damage to wildlife. The Council would rather build on land that may disrupt the habitat of endangered wetland birds and wildlife that utilise urban and industrial sites.	The Essex Coast RAMS toolkit (Table 4.1 of the SPD) sets out monitoring arrangements, amounting to 'birds and visitor surveys, including a review of the effectiveness of mitigation measures.' The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. No amendment proposed.
28	Mr David Gollifer	Resident	The outline of proposals are satisfactory to protect wildlife particularly migrating birds.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
29	Mrs April Chapman	Resident	A map of the Zone of Influence would help at this earlier stage.	Noted. An improved map of the Zone of Influence is proposed to be included earlier on in the SPD where it is first mentioned.
30	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	Good to see a raise in profile of environmental concerns. Congratulations on work to restore wetlands for the benefit it brings.	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
31	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	<p>I feel that disturbance being avoided totally should be stated more clearly as an option. If we are to halt the decline in the UK's wildlife, there are undoubtedly areas where the habitat needs to take a precedence and be left undisturbed.</p> <p>At the moment the introduction appears to immediately be putting forward a message that LPA's have the go ahead to accommodate people disturbing natural areas through mitigation.</p>	The specific scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth. Imposing restrictions on access to areas of the Essex Coast is a possible mitigation measure. No amendment proposed.
32	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	There could be some explanation in this section - so at an early stage in the document - of the type of physical arrangements that could be implemented to mitigate the effects of increased visitor pressure.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Other forms of on-site mitigation will be delivered through other mechanisms and through measures recommended within project-level HRA/AAs, which will still be necessary for individual development proposals. No amendment proposed.
33	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust	<p>Pollution from sewerage works is a problem. Anglia Water are not keeping pace with the explosion of new housing being built in the south east.</p> <p>There is now a very serious lack of infrastructure, which includes road and fresh water run off. The sea wall, tidal mud flats and salt marshes, etc do make a good nature barrier.</p>	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Local Plans take into consideration the wider impacts of new development on infrastructure such as sewerage and water supply. No amendment proposed.
34	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	It would appear that this document thinks that simply raising money will protect the birds and the wildlife on the Essex Coast. There are many other aspects to consider, e.g. The coastal footpath should be abandoned / The Essex Wildlife Trust should cease bringing coachloads of children to the Walton cliffs looking for fossils / The right to roam should be restricted / Planning committees should restrict development in Conservation Areas	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			/ An artist's impression 2019 of a proposal between Crossrail and the RSPB to develop Wallasea Island into a wetland site for birdlife shows a maze of pathways and viewing areas for the public.	The SPD sets out how the tariff, and how the money will be collected and spent. No amendment proposed.
35	Mr Peter Steggles	Resident	There must be allocated areas for similar activities namely jet skis, water skiing, sea kayaking etc and education of the general public too. New homeowners should be included and given the opportunity to take 'pride of ownership' and take part in clean-up projects etc.	The RAMS document outlines and justifies the various strategic mitigation measures proposed. No amendment required.
36	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowlers Association	First, the BWA supports the principle of preventing an increase to disturbance of wetlands on the Essex coastal area. Secondly, we recognise that some level of visitors to the wetlands is both necessary and unavoidable and would like to consider the current state as a baseline.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
37	Councillor Jenny Sandum	Braintree District Council	Very much welcome the requirements for mitigation.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
38	Mr Mark Nowers	RSPB	Whilst we were an active and willing participant in the workshops that took place in 2018, we were not invited, nor given the opportunity to comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment for this strategy. Crucial to the success of this strategy is: 1. effective monitoring of recreational activity; 2. effective monitoring and analysis of impacts on waterbird populations (WeBS data is useful but this only covers roosts at high tides and will not cover the impacts on feeding birds on mudflats or functionally-linked cropped lands for foraging dark-bellied brent geese); 3. access management strategies that are tailored to each site; 4. effective coverage of sites by the right number of rangers at key sites and at key times of the week/weekends and the right periods in the day, i.e. early morning dog-walks; 5. rangers should be full-time throughout the year to ensure expertise and site knowledge is retained and face-to-face time with the public is prioritised over administration and other tasks; 6. The strategy must take advantage of the best practice developed elsewhere in the country, i.e. Bird Aware Solent, and seek to continually evolve avoid re-inventing the wheel.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report accompanied the SPD as part of this consultation and was separately subject to consultation with the statutory consultees of Natural England (NE), Historic England (HE) and the Environment Agency (EA).  It can be considered that the points made may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The involvement of the RSPB is welcomed and once approved, the Delivery Officer will engage directly with key local stakeholders including RSPB. The effectiveness of the

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. The project is considered best practice elsewhere and in 2019 become part of the Bird Award brand. No amendment proposed.
39	Mrs Jackie Deane	Great Dunmow Town Council	The Town Council is supportive of the proposals.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
40	Mr Gavin Roswell	Resident	In 1.1, the wording 'is necessary' is alarmist, as it is only the opinion of a relatively small amount of people. There are studies out there that are in complete contradiction to the whole RAMS ethos, but the agenda cloaking has already started, with narrow focus groups promoting their thoughts as fact.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. The RAMS is evidence-based and has been developed in conjunction with Natural England. No amendment proposed.
41	Mr Stephen Tower	Resident	Protecting wildlife is of upmost importance.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
42	Miss Georgie Sutton	Marine Management Organisation (Planning)	<p>Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure the necessary considerations are included. In the case of the SPD, the draft South East Marine Plan is of relevance. The South East Marine Plan is currently out for consultation until 6th April 2020. As the plan is out for consultation, it is now a document for material consideration.</p> <p>All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and any relevant adopted Marine Plan, in this case the draft South East Marine Plan, or the UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS) unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Please see below suggested policies from the draft South East Marine Plan that we feel are most relevant. They are provided only as a</p>	Once approved the South East Marine Plan as well as the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans will become part of the Development Plan for the relevant LPAs. An amendment to recognise these Plans, and their policies, within the SPD is proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>recommendation and we would suggest your own interpretation of the South East Marine Plans is completed: MPAs, Tourism and Recreation, Biodiversity, Disturbance, Marine Litter, Water quality, Access.</p> <p>The area in the Stour Estuary Zone of Influence and the Hamford Water Zone of Influence also extend into the East Marine Plan area. Therefore, you may need to consider the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans as well. Please see below suggested policies which may be of relevance: Social, Ecology, Biodiversity, MPAs, Governance, Tourism and Recreation.</p>	
43	Ms Liz Carlton	Resident	<p>While we understand the need for more housing, we feel very strongly that mitigation in this area is essential. We are not sure that the tariff of £122.30 per dwelling will suffice to protect the area for wildlife. We believe that it will be imperative to ensure that some areas are restricted and protected as wildlife only areas. There will need to be a budget for ensuring that damage is monitored, and repair is carried out before irreversible.</p>	<p>The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Other forms of mitigation will be delivered through other mechanisms and through measures recommended within project-level HRA/AAs, which will still be necessary for individual development proposals. No amendment proposed.</p>
44	Mr Steve Betteridge	Resident	<p>While we understand the need for more housing, we are not sure that the plan to charge residents for this mitigation will be sufficient to protect the area for future generations.</p>	<p>The tariff is charged to developers not residents. The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Other forms of on-site mitigation will be delivered through other mechanisms and through measures recommended within project-level HRA/AAs, which will still be necessary for individual development proposals. No amendment proposed.</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
45	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	Some projects that would mitigate potential damage to RAMS areas flounder for a variety of unnecessary reasons. There should be a specific section, referenced, that would cover areas in and around the Zone of Influence that would assist in protecting various sections within the RAMS format. It should enable LPA's, PC's etc to support and draw support from governing bodies in areas that they cannot directly control such as Essex Highways. Regulations around unauthorised developments need to be changed for these types of areas to give the planning and enforcement groups some support, stopping the irritating and harmful occupations that can go on for years.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. Essex Highways and LPA planning enforcement are outside the scope of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
46	Mr Mark Marshall	Resident	The consultation is a great step forward for conservation. It may not address all problems, but awareness is the key.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
47	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	No comments on this introductory section.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
48	Parish Clerk Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
49	Mrs Jenny Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Langford & Ulting Parish Council agree that it is necessary to protect the wildlife of the Essex coast from increased visitor pressure associated with new residential development. There is also a need to protect the wildlife on the rivers and canals in Essex as the increase in population uses them for amenity purposes (walking, boating, fishing, dog walking, cycling etc).	Noted. No amendment proposed.
50	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	It is worth explaining here that Bird Aware Essex Coast is the brand name of the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Partnership.	An amendment is proposed to explain the role of Bird Aware Essex Coast within this Section of the SPD.
51	Ms Beverley McClean	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB team	The AONB team is not proposing any changes to the Introduction section of the RAMS SPD.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
52	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	I don't like this format - section by section.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Two – Summary of the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy

**Table 4 – Section Two: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	As we cannot stem building unfortunately this seems to set out the facts.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
2	Mrs Aileen Cockshott	Resident	Apply protective measures for protected areas of the coast - prevent powered water sports and set out exclusion zones for wind powered water sports. Dogs should be kept on lead near areas known for ground nesting birds. If protective measures are broken, then hefty fines should be imposed.	The mitigation proposed within the RAMS does not seek to prevent visitors to the Essex coast, rather its focus is on raising awareness of issues at the coast and to foster positive behaviours. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Amy Gardener-Carr	Resident	Do not build here.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed.
4	Mr Philip Dangerfield	Resident	Ensure that protection of the coast is spread evenly across the whole of Essex. Those who visit areas that are now more populated may visit more remote areas of the coastline home to nesting birds.	This is a principal aim of the RAMS and SPD. No amendment proposed.
5	Mr Bob Tyrrell	West Bergholt Parish Council	Agree and support the SPD.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Brian Springall	Resident	Before protecting wildlife, the Council needs to get its housing development plans sorted & improve the district's infrastructure i.e. roads, flood protection etc.	The need for the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) and the SPD stems from planned growth within the LPAs' adopted or emerging Local Plans. Local Plan progression is

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				ongoing within each of those partner LPAs that do not have an adopted Local Plan. No amendment proposed.
7	Mrs Julie Waldie	Resident	Happy to see wildlife taken into consideration.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	Use counties in the West Country as case studies for successful coastal management.	Elements of RAMS across the country have been considered in the formulation of the Essex Coast RAMS, where relevant to the Essex Coast. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr Brian Mills	resident	I agree with assessment.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
10	Mrs Angela Harbottle	Resident	Include wildlife protection measures such as RAMS within Essex Local Authority Local Planning documents.	The need for strategic mitigation in the form of the RAMS has been included in relevant emerging and recently adopted LPA Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr David Kennedy	Resident	Expansion of Southend Airport contradicts Essex RAMS commitments by supporting development that would impact on nesting birds on Wallasea Island. Air traffic collision with bird population could result in disaster.	The SPD is related only to in-combination recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	Why does the Essex RAMS document not include the protection of seals / seahorses? How will the tariff fund the protection of the coast? Include more manned exclusion zones along the coast to prevent disturbance from dog walkers.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to in-combination recreational effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast in relation to birds. Other forms of mitigation addressing other effects and on other designations across Essex are not within the specific scope of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
13	Mr John	Resident	Development should not be permitted on or adjacent to important coastal wildlife sites.	Noted. This is matter for individual Local Plans. The RAMS allows for new

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	McCallum			coastal residential development subject to providing appropriate mitigation measures. No amendment proposed.
14	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Implement more set coastal pathways. Stop speed boat usage along protected coastline. Prevent blocking of PROW. Ensure footpaths are open 24/7 and include more bins and maps. Clear pathways at coastal sites such as Danbury Common – brambles force members of public to overuse specific paths.	Noted. Maintenance of footpaths is not within the scope of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
15	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	Mitigation package costs should be split across entire borough – including existing households. Free parking for local residents – paid parking for those visiting from afar.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD is applicable within the Zone of Influence only and the tariff cannot be retroactively applied to consented / existing development. The SPD sets out a tariff that will be used to fund mitigation related to ‘in-combination’ recreational effects relevant to planned growth in Essex. Car parking charges are a matter for individual LPAs and landowners. Local residents should be encouraged to walk or cycle to the coast. No amendment proposed.
16	Ms Rachel Cross	Resident	What is best practice for Ramsars, SPAs and SACs? Any policy must exceed the provisions to protect wildlife and respect the environment. What about representation from the ports?	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified within the LPAs’ Local Plan HRA/AAs and related to residential growth. The RAMS draws on best practice from elsewhere and has been developed in conjunction with Natural England. No amendment proposed.
17	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	Planes release fuel over designated sites.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified within the LPAs’ Local Plan HRA/AAs and related to residential growth. The

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				impact of aviation on the environment is taken into consideration in local plans which promote airport growth, master plans for airports, planning applications for airport facilities and regulations on pollution through the environmental and aviation regulatory bodies. No amendment proposed.
18	Ms Caroline Macgregor	Brightlingsea village councillor	Town Councils should be given more weight in deciding planning applications for development – local councils more concerned for preservation and conservation.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified within the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs and related to residential growth. Decision-making on planning applications is outside the scope of this SPD. No amendment proposed.
19	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	Development in designated areas is completely inappropriate.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
20	Mr Alan Lycett	Resident	How will BREXIT impact on coastal designations?	The content of the relevant EU Directives related to birds and habitats have been transposed into UK law and will continue to apply. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	The SPD is clear and effective if actually put into practice.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr Kenneth Dawe	Resident	Needs to be balance between safeguarding wildlife and providing access for wellbeing.	The mitigation proposed within the RAMS does not seek to prevent visitors to the Essex coast, rather its focus is on raising awareness of issues at the coast and to foster positive behaviours. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
23	Mr Frederick Ager	Resident	The increase in local housing will increase visitors to this area of the path and in turn increase danger to public with the Wildfowlers Club using this area.	The SPD is related only to the in-combination recreational impacts identified within the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The effectiveness of the mitigations will be monitored during the life of the project. No amendment proposed.
24	Mr Aubrey Cornell	Resident	Housing should not be in proximity to designated areas. New residents/visitors will not respect the wildlife/countryside, making the tariff redundant. Existing visitors already disturb birds whether they are children or dogs off lead.	The need for the Essex Coast RAMS and the SPD stems from planned growth within the LPAs' adopted or emerging Local Plans. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
25	Mr Andrew Whiteley	Resident	A similar plan to RAMS could be implemented for inland habitats. Infrastructure should be evenly distributed across Essex to prevent future isolation issues.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
26	Mrs Angela McQuade	Resident	Extend designated areas to create wildlife corridors.	Protecting wildlife from development is and can be ensured and funded through other mechanisms. The extension of protected areas is not within the scope of the RAMS or the SPD. No amendment proposed.
27	MR John Camp	Resident	Exclusion zones for Jet skis should be introduced.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
28	Mr Peter Bates	Resident	No. Seems reasonable.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
29	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	Should include the benefits for community mental health.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The mitigation proposed within the RAMS does not seek to prevent visitors to the

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				Essex coast, rather its focus is on raising awareness of issues at the coast and to foster positive behaviours. No amendment proposed.
30	Mr Graham Womack	Resident	How will BREXIT impact European directives that the RAMS is based on.  The strategy only covers the coast, but some waterfowl species may also rely on inland sites.	The content of the relevant EU Directives related to birds and habitats have been transposed into UK law and will continue to apply. No amendment proposed.  The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast. Other forms of mitigation addressing effects on other designations across Essex are not within the specific scope of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
31	Mr Michael Blackwell	Resident	Tourists also visit the coast.	The SPD sets out that tourism related development will be considered on a case-by-case basis through a project level HRA. If adverse effects on integrity are predicted appropriate mitigation will be required, which could relate to the tariff proposed in the SPD. No amendment proposed.
32	Mr Mark East	Resident	How are the effects of smaller planning applications taken into consideration? It is evident from comments above that visitors travel some distance to SPA/Ramsar sites and whilst Local Plans and Major projects consider the cumulative effect there is no objective evidence that I have seen that planning applications are controlled and come under the same scrutiny. This is leading to over development in sensitive areas.	All residential development proposals, including planning permission for an individual net new dwelling within the Zone of Influence will be required to undertake a project-level HRA/AA within which specific and in-combination effects of specific proposals will be considered. The

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				Zones of Influence extend beyond local authority boundaries and show that many people travel far to visit the coast. No amendment proposed.
33	Mrs Michelle Endsor	Resident	Mitigation does not guarantee that adverse effects will not occur. The only route to success would be to completely isolate nesting bird species and prevent disturbance altogether. Housing development should seek to be located on areas that would result in the least amount of environmental impact.	Locational criteria for development are a matter for Local Plans / development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. The mitigation proposed within the RAMS focuses on raising awareness of issues at the coast and to foster positive behaviours. No amendment proposed.
34	Mr. David Gollifer	Resident	The proposals are satisfactory.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
35	Mrs April Chapman	Resident	The RAMS should also consider the future expansion of recreational establishments alongside housing.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts resulting from residential development identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. Any Habitat Site mitigation associated with other types of development (e.g. retail, education, business) would be considered at individual planning application stage by the relevant LPA. No amendment proposed.
36	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	Restore Oyster reefs alongside emerging coastal wind turbines.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts resulting from residential development identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
37	Mr Barrie	Resident	No, looks good and sensible.	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
38	Ellis Mr David Evans	Resident	Hamford Water is a man-made environment and does not fall under the EC Habitats Directive. Protection also needs to be attributed to other wildlife such as shellfish and sea mammals.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast in relation to birds. This includes the Hamford Water SPA and Ramsar. No amendment proposed.
39	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	There is not enough focus on situations where mitigation is not possible, too much focus on accommodating development. I find the way this statement has been used misleading "In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.' (Principle 15) of Agenda 21, agreed at the Rio Earth Summit, 1992. " My understanding of the precautionary approach is well described here by J. Hanson, in Encyclopaedia of the Anthropocene, 2018, "The process of applying the Precautionary Principle must be open, informed and democratic and must include potentially affected parties. It must also involve an examination of the full range of alternatives, including no action." No action has to be a clear option available to LPA's to enable them to properly consider the genuine disturbance avoidance of vulnerable and valuable habitats.	Alternative means would only need to be considered in Stage 3 of the HRA process of the LPA's Local Plans. Stage 2 of that process (AA) considers that mitigation is possible to ensure that development proposals would not have any in-combination recreational effects on the Essex Coast's Habitats Sites. As such there was no need for any of the Local Plans to progress to Stage 3 of the HRA process and the RAMS follows the process of the Stage 2 determinations / recommendations. No amendment proposed.
40	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	At this stage in the document the actual "mitigation measures" are not clearly defined. "Alternative means" - needs to be defined.	Section 4.1 details the planned mitigation to be implemented as part of the Essex Coast RAMS. Alternative means would only need to be considered in Stage 3 of the HRA process of the LPA's Local Plans. Stage 2 of that process (AA) considers that mitigation is possible to ensure that development proposals would not have any in-combination recreational effects on the Essex Coast's Habitats

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				Sites. As such there was no need for any of the Local Plans to progress to Stage 3 of the HRA process and the RAMS follows the process of the Stage 2 determinations / recommendations. No amendment proposed.
41	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust & owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	Boat movements are declining. Speed boats should be kept to low speeds to prevent disturbance. Main activity is Autumn Winter and very early spring.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
42	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	Hamford Water area requires the amalgamation of existing organisations managing the area. Hamford Water has seen many signs of degradation: sand dunes at Walton Hall marshes lost, healthy saltmarsh destroyed, Stone Point beach disappeared, cliff erosion, Naze Tower under threat and Walton Navigation channel also threatened.	Noted. The RAMS toolkit states that, for the 'Habitat based measures' Action Area, partnership working may include such organisations as 'Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, landowners, local clubs and societies.' No amendment proposed.
43	Mr John Fletcher	Resident	Wildlife at Hamford Water can be disturbed by boat, despite this the 450 boat Marina has not caused ill-effect on wildlife. Locals do not disturb wildlife, disturbance is caused predominantly by those visiting from out of the area. Coastal Path and Essex Wildlife Centre encourage disturbance, as do dog walkers and general public.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
44	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowling Association	Paragraph 2.2 – add fishing / bait digging and wildfowling. BWA monitors member activity. Litter and effluent also impacts on designated areas.	An amendment to include fishing / bait digging is proposed.
45	Mr Mark Nowers	RSPB	Paragraph 2.5 – The Outer Thames Estuary SPA should also be included. Impacts will not be limited to terrestrial activities; powered watercrafts will also need to be accounted for.	Natural England initiated the RAMS project and advised on the 10 Essex coastal sites that should be included

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				within this project. The Outer Thames Estuary is included within Table 3.1 of the SPD as 'Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsars'. An amendment to include the word 'Outer' is proposed.
46	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	Natural England promoted increased access for public on all foreshores along the Coastal Path. Using this access as a 'land-grab'. RAMS is not seen as fair and uses 'left-wing' principals.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The RAMS is an evidence-based project and has been produced in conjunction with Natural England. No amendment proposed.
47	Mr Gerry Johnson	Essex Birdwatching Society	In order to reduce disturbance to wildlife: - Dogs should be kept on leads - Fencing should be used to protect ground nesting birds - Signage should be erected to warn walkers to take care in areas of nesting birds	Section 4.1 details the planned mitigation to be implemented as part of the Essex Coast RAMS. No amendment proposed.
48	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	Online maps should have greater clarity. Both HRA & AA are negative policies. The RAMS project like the NPPF does not carry enough weight to promote areas that would divert footfall from designated areas. More co-operation between LPAs and associated bodies (Highways) would prevent the refusal of mitigation projects. Decisions need to be justified more clearly.	Amendments to replace existing maps with higher resolution images are proposed.  The SPD, in conjunction with the RAMS, ensures that mitigation is enshrined / adopted in local policy of all the LPAs. No amendment required.
49	Mr Mark Marshall	Resident	Designated areas need to be protected to prevent irreversible loss.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
50	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	England Coast Path will increase recreational pressure on the coast by providing access to areas that previously did not. Why should those delivering housing be targeted by the RAMS strategy when a government body is facilitating recreational pressures on the Essex Coast?	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
51	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS	Noted. No amendment proposed.
52	Mrs Jenny Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Impacts are unable to be mitigated, developments that are predicted to impact should not be granted planning permission.	Each LPA within Essex has a statutory duty to address housing need in their area. The mitigation proposed in the RAMS ensures that 'no significant effect' on the integrity of the Habitats Sites will be realised regarding recreational disturbance. No amendment proposed.
53	Ms Jo Steranka	Resident	<p>RAMS is inadequate to deal with future issues as there are limits to the amount of development that can take place in Essex. There will come a point where further development will have detrimental impact on the quality of the environment. Wildlife is already pressured by inappropriate behaviour; increased visitors will exacerbate these. The habitats are incredibly important as there is so little left across Europe.</p> <p>Essex County Council should provide guidance that restricts recreational development that would act to disturb wildlife populations at the coast, as well as, development that would act to connect undesignated areas to designated sites. Essex County Council should also recognise that continued development will impact on existing international commitments.</p>	The need for the Essex Coast RAMS and the SPD stems from planned growth within the LPAs' adopted or emerging Local Plans. The mitigation proposed in the RAMS ensures that 'no significant effect' on the integrity of the Habitats Sites will be realised regarding recreational disturbance. It is the LPAs that are responsible for preparing, adopting, delivering and implementing the RAMS and the SPD, not Essex County Council (ECC). No amendment proposed.
54	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	<p>Similar strategies endorsed by Natural England are not tried and tested.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6 – Who is the regulatory body that ensures Habitats Regulations are met? Will NE, RSPB and EWT be statutory consultees on all planning applications?</p> <p>Paragraph 2.13 – Requires strengthening – variable tariff required?</p>	<p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Natural England are the statutory body that ensure the Habitats Regulations</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>Paragraph 2.14 – Independent bodies are not endorsing the strategy. Strategy is a ‘soft’ approach, no code of conduct for water sports clubs currently available. By-laws will require updating as they are not directly related to birds or wildlife. Those caught littering should be fined as part of updated by-laws.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.15 – the tariff charged to developers could be passed to home owners – increasing property prices.</p>	<p>are met, as a consultee for HRA/AA documents. Other bodies are permitted to comment on all live planning applications.</p> <p>A variable tariff has not been supported within the RAMS and SPD as overall ‘in-combination’ effects are not variable and distinguishable across the County.</p> <p>The remit of the RAMS and SPD is to ensure the strategic mitigation package is delivered. No amendment proposed.</p>
55	Ms Beverley McClean	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB team	<p>For consistency the following text should be added to the notes section:</p> <p>Special Protection Areas (SPAs) are sites which support rare, vulnerable and migratory birds and are designated under the Birds Directive.</p> <p>Special Areas for Conservation (SACs) are sites which support high-quality habitats and species and are designated under the Habitats Directive.</p>	<p>An amendment to move the glossary to front of the SPD is proposed, with added description explained in footnotes where necessary and newly introduced.</p>
56	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	<p>The importance of the Essex coastline for wildlife - as evidenced by the extent of designated Habitats Sites - cannot be over emphasised. CPRE very much supports the strategic approach to mitigation measures outlined in this section - not least, for the consistent, pragmatic and fair process which it provides. The provisions of the SPD need to be implementable and effective and this combined approach creates the robust framework to achieve the objectives of RAMS.</p>	<p>Noted. No amendment proposed.</p>
57	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	<p>I don't like this format - section by section - my comments are general.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.</p>



### Section 3 – Scope of the SPD

*Table 5 – Section Three: Summary of consultation responses and actions*

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	Do not build so many homes.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. How this is achieved is set out in Local Plans. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed.
2	Mrs Aileen Cockshott	Resident	Tourist accommodation and caravan parks should be within scope.	The effects and subsequent mitigation of tourist related development proposals will be considered on a case by case basis. Section 3.9 of the SPD states that, 'tourist accommodation, may be likely to have significant effects on protected habitat sites related to recreational pressure and will in such cases need to be subject of an Appropriate Assessment as part of the Habitats Regulation.' No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Amy Gardener-Carr	Resident	Instead of building properties, fence this land off and make them sanctuaries.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS SPD does not propose new development. The mitigation proposed within the RAMS focuses on raising awareness of issues at the coast and to foster

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				positive behaviours. No amendment proposed.
4	Mr Bob TYRRELL	West Bergholt Parish Council	Fully agree.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
5	Mrs Julie Waldie	Resident	Sounds fair.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	How do you collect post code data from visitors? If property has not been built on these sites, then no data will be available yet. Could it also be that a small number of visitors to the coastal areas of concern are the same repeat visitors, and that the majority of local residents never, or rarely visit most of the coast.	Survey data was collected from the general public who visited the coast prior to the new development to best understand where visitors come from and are likely to come from in the future. The Zones of Influence were then calculated to determine what areas would be required to contribute the RAMS tariff to provide strategic mitigation across Essex. No amendment proposed.
7	Mrs Angela Harbottle	Resident	I agree with the measures outlined.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr David Kennedy	Resident	The tariff should apply to commercial development as well.	The SPD is related only to recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs and as a result of recreational effects caused by new housing. Other effects on Habitats Sites from commercial development will be considered through individual project-level HRA/AAs, if such assessment is required. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr	Resident	This all seems very sensible.	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Charles Joynson			
10	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	<p>Maldon riverside is becoming a commercial venue- a mock attempt at a seaside, as easy to drive to but it is spoilt along the Prom now and charging for a huge car park is not being returned to improve anything in the way of doing anything to help the wildlife.</p> <p>Hullbridge riverside has many birds but as each new development takes out more hedges and trees where do they go? The once narrow Hullbridge riverside path is now cut right back for public access and tall grass edges mown and that is along a natural riverside walk - why?</p>	<p>The need for the Essex Coast RAMS and the SPD stems from planned residential growth within the LPAs' adopted or emerging Local Plans. Other forms of mitigation addressing effects on other designations across Essex are not within the specific scope of the SPD.</p> <p>No amendment proposed.</p>
11	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	<p>Mitigation package costs should be split across entire borough – including existing households. Free parking for local residents – paid parking for those visiting from afar.</p>	<p>The Essex Coast RAMS SPD is applicable within the Zone of Influence only and the tariff cannot be retroactively applied to consented / existing development. The SPD sets out a tariff that will be used to fund mitigation related to 'in-combination' recreational effects relevant to planned growth in Essex. Car parking charges are a matter for individual LPAs and landowners. Local residents should be encouraged to walk or cycle to the coast. No amendment proposed.</p>
12	Mr Matt Eva	Resident	<p>The Zone of Influence for Southend and Crouch/Roach estuaries seem too small.</p>	<p>The Essex Coast RAMS Zones of Influence are based upon data collected through visitor surveys approved by Natural England. No amendment proposed.</p>
13	Mrs Jane Rigler	Resident	<p>Why is the measurement in kilometres - we still use miles in the UK so I think it should be changed.</p>	<p>An amendment is proposed to include both kilometres and metres within the SPD.</p>
14	Ms Caroline	Brightlingsea village councillor	<p>Distance boundaries should be extended.</p>	<p>The Essex Coast RAMS Zones of Influence are based upon data</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Macgregor			collected through visitor surveys approved by Natural England. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Peter Dervin	Resident	People should at every stage be the number one consideration, while we have people living on the streets and sofa surfing, and a lack of care for the elderly and disabled sorry but wildlife has to come second.	The SPD and RAMS ensures that residential development schemes within the Zone of Influence can come forward with an assurance that there will be no significant in-combination recreational effects on Habitats Sites on the Essex Coast. No amendment proposed.
16	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	Ok.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Andrew Whiteley	Resident	No mention of improved infrastructure. Essex roads trains and buses are already stretched and that's without the impact on social services.	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan and infrastructure delivery plans. No amendment proposed.
18	Mrs Angela McQuade	Resident	Regulations should be upheld in all cases.	The SPD provides the robust framework for ensuring the regulations are upheld. Noted. No amendment proposed.
19	Mr Peter Bates	Resident	Zone of Influence for both Benfleet and Southend Marshes and Thames Estuary and Marshes should be larger. Commercial development should also be considered within the RAMS.	The Essex Coast RAMS Zones of Influence are based upon data collected through visitor surveys approved by Natural England. Other effects on Habitats Sites from commercial development will be considered through individual project-level HRA/AAs, if such assessment is required. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
20	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	Should include Hanningfield reservoir as this also supports wildlife relevant to this document and has the same pressures as this discussed in the subject matter.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast in relation to birds. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Graham Womack	Resident	With regards to para 3.10. What happens if outline permission has already been granted (without consideration of RAMS). Will it become compulsory to add it to the subsequent full application?	The SPD proposes that if in-combination recreational effects have been suitably addressed at the outline stage, in the form of mitigation, then the tariff would not apply at the reserved matters stage. If such effects have not been addressed of individual proposals at the outline stage, then the tariff would be applicable to that proposal at the reserved matters stage. No amendment proposed.
22	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	Visitors to Essex Coast are not just residents, general public from all over the country visit also.	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
23	Mr Mark East	Resident	Why do the Zone of Influence distances vary greatly? How were the Zones of Influences calculated from visitor surveys?	The Essex Coast RAMS Zones of Influence are based upon data collected through visitor surveys, such as postcode data of visitors. This exercise helps to determine where and how far residents will travel to the Essex Coast, and has been approved by Natural England. No amendment proposed.
24	Mrs Michelle Endsor	Resident	The wetland areas along The River Crouch also makes the village of Great Stambridge and surrounding areas a flood plain which is at risk of extreme flooding approx. every 50-100 years.  Whilst we take this into consideration when insuring our properties and	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. Issues raised relate to the distribution of new development and

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>are lucky enough to be surrounded by farmers who will "double ditch" when the rain levels increase, to consider build housing in areas of flood seems completely irresponsible. Not to mention that increasing the population in an area with no facilities, no doctors surgery, no bus services, no shops, etc ensures that roads that were not built to take large amounts of traffic are stretched to the limit as road travel is the only way to access work and necessities for a larger populous.</p> <p>That larger populous and their road travel, as well as visitor influx will again only serve to disrupt the wildlife population further.</p> <p>As residents of long standing that have been witness to the wildlife decline in this area over the last 3 generations, we cannot object enough to any development of the wetland areas.</p>	<p>supporting infrastructure as matters for Local Plans. This includes the possible impacts on and mitigations for flooding. No amendment proposed.</p>
25	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	<p>More emphasis on environmental impact in the long term. Infrastructure must come before greater demand is generated.</p>	<p>The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The impact of the RAMS will be regularly monitored. Infrastructure to support new housing growth is a matter for Local Plans. No amendment proposed.</p>
26	Mr David Evans	Resident	<p>There are significant and important other Statutory Bodies with strong legal and commercial interests in Hamford Water - Harwich Harbour Authority, who has control over the navigation and collect Port Dues for shipping movements to Bramble Island; Crown Estates, who own most of Hamford Water below the low tide level.</p>	<p>Noted. Joint working arrangements can be acted upon by the Delivery Officer. No amendment proposed.</p>
27	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	<p>Please include the point that certain habitats cannot be mitigated against and are too valuable to have building close by which will increase the disturbance.</p> <p>There should be clear provision and targets to leave some habitat entirely undisturbed.</p>	<p>The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast. Under the Habitats Regulations each development proposal will need a project-level HRA. This is still the case for proposals within the Zone of Influence, and any resultant AA will set out</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				recommendations to mitigate effects that are directly related to the proposal. No amendment proposed.
28	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	This section is well written and explores the practicalities.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
29	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	Yes, S.E. Essex, is now past breaking point with the recent addition of new dwellings. Release all farmland around London, say a radius of 8 miles. This also would mean less journey times.	Locational criteria for development are a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. No amendment proposed.
30	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	Increase the Zone of Influence to include boroughs of London due to weekend visitors to areas of the Essex Coast.  The only possible way Recreational disturbance Avoidance can be applied is to control the number of dwellings permitted in designated areas.	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The Zoi were informed by visitor surveys. No amendment proposed.
31	Mr John Fletcher	Resident	A very unfair and totally unnecessary 'tax'.	The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. The tariff is 'evidence based' and has been calculated by dividing the cost of the RAMS mitigation package by the number of dwellings (housing growth) proposed in LPA Local Plans. The tariff is paid by developers of new houses, not

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				residents, and as a one-off payment. It is not a tax. No amendment proposed.
32	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowlers Association	The BWA is not planning any building work within the RAMS Zone of Influences. Predatory species such as foxes thrive in urban areas, potentially increasing pressure on ground nesting birds.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
33	Mr Mark Nowers	RSPB	3.4 The Outer Thames Estuary SPA should be added here. Paragraph 2.2 above sets out the coast is "a major destination for recreational use such as walking, sailing, bird-watching, jet skiing and dog walking."	The Outer Thames Estuary is included within Table 3.1 of the SPD as 'Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsars'. An amendment to include the word 'Outer' is proposed.
34	Mr Stephen Tower	Resident	No residential housing should be built around this area as it is vital to protect the region and its wildlife. How about using housing that is not currently being used?	Under the Habitats Regulations each development proposal will need a project-level HRA. This is still the case for proposals within the Zone of Influence, and any resultant AA will set our recommendations to mitigate effects that are directly related to the proposal. New housing growth is a matter for Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
35	Mrs Angela Faulds	Brentwood and Chelmsford Green Party	We feel the zones of influence are understated.	The Essex Coast RAMS Zones of Influence are based upon data collected through visitor surveys approved by Natural England. No amendment proposed.
36	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	<p>It is being recognised more and more that the changes to where people live along with other publicity has started to change the way many residents are behaving. In some areas it has already changed the way councils are looking at housing design, road design and development.</p> <p>In these areas, roads are only built where they are needed to feed residents' requirements and earlier designations no longer directly feeding dwellings are changed to paths and cycle ways to develop green links between areas. This is not only important so as to encourage healthier life</p>	Noted. These issues relate Local Plans rather than specifically to this SPD. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>styles as designated in the NPPF but to give an acceptable alternative to paths within the Ramsar or SPA areas which do not currently exist for the many cyclists, horse riders and strollers within the various communities.</p> <p>This will not happen by chance it needs the legislation adjusted to give greater backing to PLA and Parish councils who understand what is needed for their areas.</p>	
37	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	<p>CLA members in the areas and zones of influence covered by the SPD may be considering small-scale residential developments on their land, and others may be considering setting up tourism enterprises. These enterprises will provide employment opportunities and will make a valuable contribution to the rural economy. Housing developments on our members' land will help the Government and local authorities to meet housing targets and may include low-cost "starter" units on rural exception sites.</p> <p>These projects will be affected by the financial contributions proposed, when combined with any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions additionally levied.</p>	The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from an increase in population associated with housing growth. This includes both allocations in the LPAs' Local Plans and also non-allocated growth that may come forward within plan-periods. No amendment proposed.
38	Mr Steven Smith	Comments offered on behalf of: Lower Farm, East End Green, Brightlingsea	<p>In line with the NPPF and Local Plan Policy the definition of exclusions within Table 3.2: Planning Use Classes covered by the Essex Coast RAMS, under the Sui Generis Planning Class should be amended to clarify that it applies to: leisure and tourism facilities:</p> <p>Amend: - Residential caravan sites (excludes holiday caravans and campsites) To: - Residential caravan sites (excludes leisure and tourism facilities)</p> <p>In addition, para 3.9 of the SPD states that "... tourism accommodation, may be likely to have significant effects on protected habitat sites related to recreational pressure ...". It is proposed that this should be amended to: "... tourism accommodation, could potentially effect protected habitat sites related to recreational pressure ..."</p>	<p>The SPD wording regarding residential caravan sites reflects the permanency of residents, with those associated with tourism (holiday caravans and campsites) being subject to consideration on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The wording 'may be likely to have significant effects' is specifically in line with the wording of the Habitats Regulations, and in reference to the test in those regulations to assess 'likely significant effects'. No amendment proposed.</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			It is recognised that any contribution that may result from an Appropriate Assessment of leisure and tourism facilities would be assessed on a "case by case basis" (clarified within footnote *** of Table 3.2). However, the level of contribution should be benchmarked and clarified within the SPD i.e. £5 per facility/unit (similar to an all-day parking fee at an Essex Wildlife Trust site), or in line with the Tourism Sector Deal (November 2018) local Environmental and Tourism Trust Funds could be set up between a developer/operator and the relevant District Authority whereby a contribution of £1 per tourist per day is paid to support the management of the specific habitat site that may be affected by the development.	Regarding the extent of the tariff that may be applicable to tourist related development, it would be inappropriate to benchmark this per unit, as the level of recreational effect may vary from proposal to proposal. No amendment proposed.
39	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
40	Mrs Jenny Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Support the approach.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
41	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	<p>3.6 A case could be made for new large business units over a certain square footage contributing to the mitigation strategy here. Large corporate companies, such as Amazon, could help cover the cost of their environmental impact.</p> <p>3.9 Tourist accommodation: To stop people flying, we need to encourage "stay locations", Many small businesses like family run B&amp;B's will probably not be able to succeed financially if a tariff or tax for the strategy was imposed on them. Again, larger, corporate entities such as hotel chains need to carry the cost if this is going to be looked at.</p> <p>3.10 We already have experience where HRA's have not been completed as part of REM Planning Application where the original outline application is over 2 years old. How will parallel or twin tracked applications be dealt with that exist under 1 OUT application?</p>	<p>The SPD is related only to those recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Any tariff imposed on tourist related development would not be retroactively sought, and will apply only to new development proposals No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The tariff will be imposed to those proposals at the reserved matters stage that have not considered</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				recreational effects at the outline stage. No amendment proposed.
42	Ms Beverley McClean	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB team	<p>The scope of the RAMS SPD is considered appropriate. The AONB team agrees with the Use Classes and the types of developments that will be subject to a RAMS tariff.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7 of the SPD could be more explicit and state that proposals for single dwellings will be subject to a RAMS tariff.</p>	Noted. An amendment introducing additional clarification within Paragraph 3.7 is proposed.
43	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	<p>This is a key section of the SPD because it identifies where the RAMS is applicable. The Zones of Influence (Zone of Influence) map is critical. It attempts to show the sphere of influence - based on the postcode of coastal visitors - as roughly concentric circles. The result is nonsensical in that up to 40-50% of some of the Zones is North Sea. A methodology which centres a Zone of Influence on a designated Habitats site is therefore flawed. Instead the Zone should reflect the fact that many visitors come from without a tight circular catchment, often living in major centres of population and close to the main highway network. Linear Zones therefore stretch beyond the immediate local catchment area. In this respect, there is no indication as to how the Zones are defined - i.e. the proportion of total visitor numbers and from which postcodes.</p> <p>This is exemplified by the influence of the main sailing centres - notably on the Stour and Blackwater estuaries but also elsewhere - where considerable numbers of boat owners (regular visitors) live much further afield. Also, this approach results in high proportions of certain Zone of Influences stretching outside of Essex and there is no indication of the existence or relationship with similar SPDs adopted by the appropriate Suffolk and Kent local authorities.</p> <p>CPRE supports the range of applications, schemes and Use Classes covered by the SPD. However, given the potential for significant and higher impact from proposals for tourist accommodation, suggests there should be more explicit guidance in the SPD as to how LPAs would make "a different assessment of effects".</p>	The Essex Coast RAMS project and associated methodology has been recognised and approved by Natural England. The methodology that determined the Zones of influence was also approved by NE. The Essex Coast RAMS is also only concerned with recreational pressures arising as a result of proposed development found within emerging and adopted Local Plans. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
44	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	I do not like this format - section by section.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Four - Mitigation

**Table 6 – Section Four: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	The per tariff detail seems somewhat irrelevant when I have no idea how much money this will generate per annum and how much money is actually needed per annum.	The mitigation package has been calculated based upon the period of March 2019-2038. Details of this can be found in Section 4.3 which details the overall cost. The RAMS itself includes phasing details of Local Plan housing allocations, and the tariff will be collected for these dwellings. Therefore, the money collected per annum reflects housing growth directly. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	<p>The Essex Coast cannot be 'recreated', 'moved elsewhere' or 'compensated for'.</p> <p>Birds do not Need People visiting and disturbing them. You should therefore not do anything that would cause this. One example is to build more houses such that this will happen. It's a simply point of logic.</p> <p>A tariff is no use to birds. You have stated that their Survival depends on preserving their Environment and not disturbing them. How does a 'tariff' assist that?</p> <p>Your reasoning is faulty. Clearly there is conflict in what you say. You cannot mitigate the effects of disturbance. Especially not with money.</p>	Each LPA within Essex has a statutory duty to address housing need in a way that will not cause significant effects on Habitats Sites. The RAMS and SPD ensures that this can be done. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			If, as you say, you want to Prevent disturbance to European bird sites, do not create more disturbance by recreation, housing or anything else. You are kidding yourselves if you think you can have your cake and eat it.	
3	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	Seems a small financial contribution so long as developers can't fiddle their way out of it as they seem to with social housing commitments.	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying proposals, then alternative mitigation, agreed by Natural England, would be required or planning permission would not be given. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Amy Gardener-Carr	Resident	Make more actuaries for wildlife.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
5	Mr Bob Tyrrell	West Bergholt Parish Council	The proposals seem reasonable.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
6	Mrs Julie Waldie	Resident	I'm glad the developers will foot the bill, sounds right to me.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
7	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	Without doing the sums this figure of 9 million pounds seems a bit vague, as there seems a lot of unknown variables. Which are not easy to quantify. Am I right in thinking that this is an annual payment by each household? Also, that the property must be a future build within certain designated zones?	The Essex Coast RAMS tariff is a one-off cost that applies to residential developments within the Zone of Influence when they are consented. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr Brian Mills	Resident	I see no mention of actual measures to enforce the requirement -- money will not always correct a poor situation.	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying proposals, then alternative mitigation, agreed by Natural England, would be required or planning permission would not be given. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
9	Mrs Linda Samuels	Resident	Are the contributions compulsory? What will be consequences of non-payment?	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying proposals, then alternative mitigation, agreed by Natural England, would be required or planning permission would not be given. No amendment proposed.
10	Mr David Kennedy	Resident	Should apply to commercial development also.	The SPD is related only to recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs and as a result of recreational effects. Other effects on Habitats Sites from commercial development will be considered through individual project-level HRA/AAs, if such assessment is required. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	The fact that there may be other site-specific mitigation requirements in respect of Habitats sites and ecology gives me some hope that effective mitigation can be implemented. I still suspect the cash contribution for each dwelling will be far too low.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigating the effects of 'in-combination' recreational effects only. Other types of effect can be expected to be mitigated in other ways. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr John McCallum	Resident	You cannot mitigate for loss of wildlife habitat. I fundamentally disagree that there should be any permitted development in protected zones.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD addresses development within the defined Zones of Influence. Each LPA within Essex has a statutory duty to address housing need in their area. No amendment proposed.
13	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Money will not fix the problem - it is care of natural places. ALL roads should be made with tunnels for animals to cross and ALL new developments should have to leave wild verges and hedges and trees. Destroying old hedges/trees should be banned, as it takes a whole generation - 50 years to grow a mature tree. Tariffs of £100,000,000 will	The SPD is related only to those recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The tariff provides the funding to take mitigation measures to address the

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			not fix up a river overnight and meanwhile the animals look for homes to breed where theirs have been destroyed.	impacts of increased visitors to the coastal areas. No amendment proposed.
14	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	The Section 106 agreement, is this based on the 106 that was agreed with the council and Southend Airport?	Section 106 is a mechanism to secure infrastructure or funding to address the impacts of new development. The Section 106 agreement for Southend Airport is a separate matter. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Matt Eva	Resident	Need to think about unintended consequences. Will this lead to greater development just outside of the proposed Zone of Influence - which will impact the habitats but lead to no revenue for the mitigations.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
16	Ms Caroline Macgregor	Brightlingsea village councillor	Mitigation costs should be vastly increased and also be required to produce sustainable zero carbon foot print buildings to increase protection of areas.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated by identifying the costs of mitigation required to address planned housing growth within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	Placing a tax on developers to dissuade them from submitting an application is not a solution in my view. It is not possible to enforce any of these statutes, people cannot be trusted to obey the law. Existing laws are broken on a daily basis, adding new ones would only make policing them more difficult.	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying proposals, then alternative mitigation, agreed by Natural England, would be required or planning permission would not be given. The tariff is not designed to dissuade applications, but to ensure that funding is in place to address the impacts of increased visitors to the Essex coastal area. No amendment proposed.
18	Cllr Malcolm Fincken	Halstead, Hedingham and	We agree with these proposals.	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
		District Branch Labour Party		
19	Mr Peter Dervin	Resident	The mitigation payments should be ring fenced towards care for people not wildlife. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. Pure madness to add an additional payment to developers that isn't people-centred.	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
20	Mr Alan Lycett	Resident	Tariffs should be progressive so that larger properties pay more. Perhaps charge by number of bedrooms?	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigation and planned housing growth contained within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	OK.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr Aubrey Cornell	Resident	Increase the tariff significantly in order to deter the initiation of such developments close to these sites.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated by identifying the costs of mitigation required to address planned housing growth within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
23	Mr Andrew Whiteley	Resident	No mention of improved infrastructure. Essex roads trains and buses are already stretched and that's without the impact on social services.	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational effects identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
24	Mrs Angela McQuade	Resident	Payment is not enough.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated by identifying the costs of mitigation required to address planned housing growth within the LPA's adopted or



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				emerging Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
25	Mr Peter Bates	Resident	Essential to ensure that all financial contributions [including for part-projects] meet all costs identified and that they are paid BEFORE commencement of the work [or stage of project], and that all funds are held securely and that they are USED IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY DIRECTLY AFFECTED and not in other locations. Funding should only be used for physical measures, not legal advice, administration etc.	The tariff will need to be paid before the commencement of the development in all cases. As effects are related to housing growth in the entirety of the Zone of Influence, mitigation will be limited to within the Zone of Influence as appropriate. No amendment proposed.
26	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	Developers of larger sites must as well as paying levies make suitable arrangements to integrate the disturbed wildlife. Examples being tunnels under roadways, extra plantations of hedgerows/trees. Or sponsorship of a suitable wildlife scheme developed for that zone.	The on-site requirements of large scale housing development proposals are not within the remit of the RAMS or SPD and will be identified through project-level HRA/AAs. Developers of strategic sites are encouraged to engage with the relevant LPA for specific guidance on what is considered appropriate. No amendment proposed.
27	Mr Graham Womack	Resident	<p>I support the concept of requiring the payments to be made at the start of a development phase.</p> <p>I have reviewed several planning documents over the past 12 months. I cannot recall having seen any specific reference to the tariff that is now being proposed.</p> <p>How will the tariff funding be allocated to mitigation work. Who will ensure that the relevant funds are only allocated to RAMS mitigation, and not to other local projects? I can recall several instances where local councils have proposed uses for S106 monies, only to be told that the funds are no longer available.</p>	The SPD, once adopted, will form a planning document that sets out the implications of the RAMS for developers. The Essex Coast RAMS mitigation will be managed by a dedicated RAMS Delivery Officer who will liaise with each LPA's own monitoring officers. Mitigation will be delivered at a strategic level ensuring it is applied to mitigate the effects of housing growth. No amendment proposed.
28	Mr Michael	Resident	This seems reasonable.	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Blackwell			
29	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	I think the tariff is too low. I also have concerns that the buyer actually ends up paying this. I would prefer to see more ecological building material and a focus on sustainability for houses within these zones. If you want to live near a beautiful place that attracts wildlife, then your property and lifestyle shouldn't cause damage. A one-off fee for a house that will last hundreds of years seems pretty insignificant in the great scheme of things. Could building limits be considered? I do agree that something should be put in place	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigation and planned housing growth contained within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
30	Councillor Richard van Dulken	Braintree District Council	I question the acceptability of Section 106 monies generated in Braintree, for instance, being used 20 or 30 miles away for totally unconnected purposes.	The Essex Coast RAMS aims to deliver a strategic approach to mitigation that was recommended within each LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AA, including that of Braintree District Council. Zones of Influence were based upon visitor surveys conducted to determine the distance at which visitors can be expected from new development. The collection of the tariff does not prejudice investment in infrastructure by developers in the locality of the new development. No amendment proposed.
31	Mr Mark East	Resident	The tariff is a drop in the ocean against the margin of profit for developers. The document implies that it is avoiding harm, but it is in fact fast tracking planning applications which are the source of harm. It is inconceivable that the provision of a small green space will deter residents from visiting the sites. Is there any scientific evidence or survey to objectively demonstrate any notable change of movement away from visiting SPA/Ramsar sites when green space is provided?	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. It can be expected that other mitigation requirements and contributions will be expected of developments, to address other effects on Habitats Sites identified within project-level HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
32	Mrs Michelle Endsor	Resident	<p>As previous stated, these factors are speculative and unproven. Once these "mitigations" fail, which with the delicate wildlife balance in this area, we have no doubt they will, it is too late, and we have lost valuable breeding areas for future generations.</p> <p>It is also stipulated that payments will be charged to fund this gamble with our native wildlife but there is never any guarantee that these monies will not at some point in the future be absorbed into other projects that are deemed more relevant to the climate of the time. The same happened with the funds from council house sales with very little being ploughed back in to finance new social housing at the time. There is always a cause considered more important down the road but in this case, unsuccessful mitigation and cuts in future funding, could see the devastation of our wetland wildlife, something which can never be rectified.</p>	The Essex Coast RAMS toolkit (Table 4.1 of the SPD) sets out monitoring arrangements, amounting to 'birds and visitor surveys, including a review of the effectiveness of mitigation measures.' The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. No amendment proposed.
33	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	<p>This must be actioned before development takes place.</p> <p>Too often developers try to reduce their section 106 agreements having built the most profitable part of the development. E.g. reducing number of "Affordable" housing or finding reasons why agreed access changes aren't practical.</p> <p>There need to be realistic penalties for later alterations that reflect loss to the community at large. Too often renegeing on commitment remains more profitable, which should never be the case.</p> <p>Use local, possibly smaller, companies to develop housing, as these have more stake in the local environment and have a more transparent reputation</p>	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying proposals, and alternative bespoke mitigation is not forthcoming (and agreed as suitable by Natural England) then planning permission would not be given. The tariff will need to be paid before the commencement of the development in all cases. No amendment proposed.
34	Mr David Evans	Resident	<p>The whole basis of how this income from a tax on new development is to be spent seems skewed to provide resources for semi-police activities and restrictions on human activity.</p> <p>Hamford Water has managed itself and the wildlife present to a very high</p>	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD relates only to the effects on Habitats Sites (as defined) which are designated on the Essex Coast. The tariff is proposed to fund a RAMS Delivery Officer and Rangers to address recreational

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>standard, without draconian legal powers and without constant surveillance.</p> <p>The Hamford Water Management Committee, upon which all statutory bodies, TDC, Essex CC, EA, users of the area, Yacht Clubs, the Royal Yachting Association, Wildfowlers, Riparian Landowners, Marinas plus all the various commercial interests are all members of this organisation and which supervises the area at NIL cost the anyone except those organisations that willingly contribute, has not been mentioned once in the RAMS documentation.</p>	<p>impacts identified through the LPA's Local Plan HRA/AAs, but not to impose restrictions beyond these specific effects. No amendment proposed.</p>
35	Mrs Dawn Afriyie	Resident	<p>Essex is already overpopulated, the road network is in a dire state, the sewer systems are old and falling apart, more housing is not needed in Essex, coastal and non-coastal.</p> <p>Our wildlife must be preserved at all costs. How many more natural habitats must be destroyed before Essex council stops building.</p>	<p>The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. Each LPA within Essex has a statutory duty to address housing need in a way that will not cause significant effects on Habitats Sites. It is the LPAs who are responsible for determining development proposals and delivering and implementing the RAMS and SPD, not ECC. No amendment proposed.</p>
36	Mrs Karen Hawkes	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	<p>Bullet point 4 states "Information on alternative sites for recreation". Whilst it is appreciated that the area needs to be protected the preferred message should be with information signage and alternative routes within the same location. This would also support tourism in the area and encourage sustainability and health benefits: if visitors are being sent to alternative locations this would result in increased motor vehicle usage; visitors may be less likely to visit the site which would affect their health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Bullet point 6 "Interpretation and signage" Members would welcome universal / uniform signage throughout all the Essex Coastal Habitats. This would assist visitors when visiting other sites as the signage format would be recognisable which would aid enforcement as visitors would be</p>	<p>The message regarding 'alternative sites for recreation' can be expected to apply to future trips for recreation.</p> <p>Noted. Comments regarding uniform signage and additional stakeholders in the partnership organisation can be acted upon by the Delivery Officer, once appointed. The project has the brand: Bird Aware Essex Coast, which Bird Aware Solent is seeking to extend around the country. No amendment proposed.</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>familiar with the signage.</p> <p>P12 Action Area Table Members would request that relevant Town and Parish Council are detailed as partnership organisation.</p> <p>P13 Budget and Appendix 1 Strategic Mitigation. Whilst members are supportive of the Action Areas identified, there are concerns as to whether they are deliverable within the budget identified. Mitigation package is £8,916,448 from March 2019 – 2038. Members suggest that the toolkit needs revisiting to ensure that the projects can be delivered within the budget available. They also identified that there is excessive funding on personnel and enforcement and insufficient funding on the delivery of actual projects.</p> <p>Members are also concerned that the type of projects proposed are already being delivered by other stakeholders and that this is an unnecessary duplication of work.</p> <p>P15 Schemes under 10 dwellings There are concerns that item 4.16 with regard to reasonable costs of completing and checking the agreement is not required and that a more straight forward method would be as a matter of course to charge the £122 a home once the location is identified within a zone as detailed on p7.</p>	<p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. The Delivery Officer, once appointed, will engage with key local stakeholders. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The mitigation package costed within the RAMS responds to new initiatives or resources required only, and similarly the tariff will not be used to pay for any existing initiatives. There will therefore be duplication of projects. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Some LPA partners do not charge a legal fee for minor applications; however these applicants are required to pay the tariff. No amendment proposed.</p>
37	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	<p>I feel it necessary to recognise that the disturbance of some habitats cannot be mitigated with financial payments. It is not clear under which circumstances this would be the case and is therefore more likely to leave habitats open to disturbance to the integrity of the habitat through a planning system weighted towards mitigation.</p> <p>We need clearer thought translated into understanding of when mitigation is not appropriate.</p>	<p>The SPD is related only to in-combination recreational effects on Habitats Sites as identified within the LPAs' emerging or adopted Local Plan HRA/AAs. Other mitigation on-site will still be required to address effects, as and when identified in project-level HRA/AAs of development proposals. No amendment proposed.</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			Certain areas should be protected from development and disturbance	
38	Mrs Lesley Mitchelmore	Danbury Parish Council	Any costs involved in protecting the Coastal Recreational Areas should be funded by legally binding section 106 agreements with developers without impacting on local councils.	Noted. Coastal Protection Areas are outside the scope of the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
39	Mr Graham Pike	Resident	A flow chart determining your obligations dependent on the developments size would be helpful.	The on-site requirements of large scale housing development proposals are not within the remit of the RAMS or SPD and will be identified through project-level HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
40	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	The use of Rangers to enforce / upkeep protected areas is good. In addition, Water Bailiffs could be employed. The £122 levy does seem low as Essex has a long coastline to "police".	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigation and planned housing growth contained within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
41	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	Planning must not be passed, where new builds increase the lack of ground soak, and will increase flooding to established property in low lying areas	The SPD is related only to in-combination recreational effects on Habitats Sites as identified within the LPAs' emerging or adopted Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
42	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	This is just another form of tax which will affect the less well off in society. 1. Who will be responsible for the setting of the tax levels? 2. How will the tax be collected 3. How will this tax be used? 4. Who will oversee the administration? 5. It will prove to be very unpopular 6. It will affect the housing market and the national economy	The SPD sets out who is responsible for the setting of the tariff, how it will be collected, how it will be used and who will oversee the administration of the project. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
43	Mr John Fletcher	Resident	How do you mitigate? Here we have a superb Warden who is employed by Tendring Council. He is experienced and has been doing the job for many years. He patrols Hamford Water and ensures the rules are not broken. I would have thought you would have understood that birds adapt. Apart from the Boats the Marina has two helicopter landing sights which cause no problems. Incidentally, at Culdrose in Cornwall, the Royal Navy has the largest helicopter base in Europe, and they have to keep Lanner hawks to keep the birds away.	The good work of existing wardens / rangers is recognised, and a key part of the mitigation package is the employment of additional coastal rangers to patrol the area and educate visitors. The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. Mitigation is set out in the costed mitigation package included within Appendix 1 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
44	Councillor Jenny Sandum	Braintree District Council	Anything that can be done to strengthen the requirement to avoid adverse impacts on Habitats sites (e.g. strengthened requirements to retain existing hedges, trees and vegetation) would be extremely well received.	The SPD is related only to in-combination recreational effects on Habitats Sites as identified within the LPAs' emerging or adopted Local Plan HRA/AAs. Other mitigation on-site will still be required to address effects, as and when identified in project-level HRA/AAs of development proposals. No amendment proposed.
45	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	£9 million of tax to be spent on telling people how they shouldn't scare birds... just imagine how much that could help change people's lives for the better if spent on making sure ex-servicemen/women had psychological support, jobs training and housing help, or assisting rape victims of grooming gangs, or a multitude of other social issues.	The Habitat Regulations require likely significant effects on Habitats sites to be mitigated. The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
46	Mrs Angela Faulds	Brentwood and Chelmsford Green Party	The mitigation amount as a whole, and the amount per dwelling, seem ridiculously small, considering the cost of housing in this area.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigation and planned housing growth contained within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. Other mitigation on-site will still be required to address effects,

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				as and when identified in project-level HRA/AAs of development proposals. No amendment proposed.
47	Mrs Katherine Kane	Rettendon Parish Council	Rettendon Parish Council supports the tariff to fund mitigation measures.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
48	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	Before you decide if Tariffs work you have to be clear on your goals. If it is to cover the costs of a scheme to reduce harm, then the tariff system with continuous monitoring may well achieve this. This does by definition mean the acceptance of gradual decline of these areas due to increasing human activity with the certainty but hopefully rare occurrence of serious failures being inevitable. Adding 0.03% to the price of a dwelling is unlikely to restrict access except possibly to the less well-paid local residents, so to constrain the developments in these sensitive areas is the only real answer. The pressure and legislation that is being used to drive the mass erosion of the Green Belt needs to be matched by an equal pressure to provide open areas, parks with the roads being balanced with paths, cycle tracks and bridle ways to provide residents an acceptable alternative. The constant erosion of PRow's due to inadequate protection and enforcement drives walkers, riders etc to the only areas left accessible inflicting unnecessary damage. Localism suggests that listening even to Rural locals might on occasion bear fruit when it comes to understanding residents' attitudes and that of those most likely to visit.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigation and planned housing growth contained within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. Other mitigation on-site will still be required to address effects, as and when identified in project-level HRA/AAs of development proposals.  Additionally, the effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
49	Mr Mark Marshall	Resident	Developer tariffs and control should be enforced more. In my area a developer tore out a protected ancient hedgerow with little more than a slap on the wrist. If there was a large fine and enforcement other developers would think twice about flouting the rules.	Payment of the tariff will be required when development is consented. No amendment proposed.
50	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	CLA members in the areas and zones of influence covered by the SPD may be considering small-scale residential developments on their land, and others may be considering setting up tourism enterprises such as camping sites, farm shops, and other retail outlets. These enterprises will provide employment opportunities and will make a valuable contribution to the rural economy. Housing developments on our members' land will help the Government and local authorities to meet housing targets and may	The SPD is related only to recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			include low-cost "starter" units on rural exception sites.  These projects will be affected by the financial contributions proposed, when combined with any CIL contributions additionally levied.	
51	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS	Noted. No amendment proposed.
52	Mr Alasdair Daw	Billericay Action Group (part of Billericay District Residents Assoc)	<p>The zones of influence are based on clumsy radii, in the west and north-west of Basildon Borough this excludes (and only just) the source of the Crouch in Billericay and some of the headwaters of the Mid-Blackwater catchment such as the Mountnessing Brook.</p> <p>The Mountnessing Brook will be affected by the development of 1700-2000 new houses (Policy H17 of the Basildon Local Plan). 2000 x £144 amounts to £288,000 so there would be a significant benefit in altering the boundary in this case.</p> <p>The Crouch would also be effected in a similar way, but it is hard to determine whether the edge of the Zone of Influence includes sites such as H18, H19 and H20.</p> <p>So it is proposed that the Zone of Influence be adjusted very slightly to reflect catchments, at least within Basildon Borough. This could apply to the Blackwater, though the arguments for the Crouch would be weaker (smaller draft Zone of Influence) and those for the Thames weaker again (only parts of it a RAMS site).</p>	The Zones of Influence found within the RAMS document have been calculated based upon data collected through visitor surveys and only relevant to Habitats Site designations. Any future adjustments to the Zones are required to be data driven and subject of ongoing monitoring proposed. No amendment proposed.
53	Mr James Taylor	Resident	I support the mitigation tariff.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
54	Ms Jo	Resident	The SPD's current approach to mitigation appears at this stage to be simply one of 'doing something that might help, although the Council	Many of the suggested actions are considered relevant for exploration by

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Steranka		<p>accepts that in the long term it will be quite unable to protect these precious habitats'.</p> <p>I would suggest the mitigation package is a very defeatist approach to protecting the Designated Sites, particularly since 5 people is an insufficient resource to police public access and environmental degradation on 350 miles of coastline.</p> <p>The mitigations need to include many more pro-active measures giving the County Council powers to manage access in a much more proactive manner. Such measures might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Bye-laws governing access to and public behaviour specific to each Designated Site.</li> <li>* Periods of site closure at sensitive times such as nesting of ground-nesting birds or seal pupping.</li> <li>* Imposition of significant on-the-spot fines on members of the public caught disturbing wildlife.</li> <li>* Prosecution of members of the public caught damaging Designated Sites, whether through littering and fly-tipping, theft of shingle and sand or other actions which degrade the quality of a Site.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst the public education approach is a start, this is too little and ineffectual.</p> <p>There is no attempt to even suggest mitigations for the pollution to the Designated Sites from land-based sources. The Essex coastline is littered with plastics which have escaped from recycling bins.</p> <p>Having set out a minimalist approach to protection of the Designated Sites, the Tariff per new dwelling is then calculated by the simple division of total cost for this inadequate programme by the expected number of new dwellings. In February 2020, the average cost of a house in Essex was £377,984. The Tariff therefore represents 0.032% of the average</p>	<p>the Delivery Officer, once appointed. This includes the annual review of both the effectiveness of the mitigation package and the extent of the tariff over the lifespan of the RAMS project. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The RAMS and SPD are relevant to housing growth at the LPA level. It is the relevant LPAs who are responsible for preparing, adopting, delivering and implementing the RAMS and SPD, not ECC. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The RAMS toolkit includes many of the proposed mitigations included in the response. The Essex RAMS toolkit includes, within the 'education and communication' Action Area, direct engagement with clubs and relevant organisations. The implementation of this can begin once the Delivery Officer is appointed. Additionally, the effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>purchase price of the new developments. This is a drop in the ocean compared to the cost of purchasing a newly-built house.</p> <p>I suggest that the approach to calculating the financial requirements for mitigating the effects of new residential development over the next 20 years needs to be revised. For the reasons above, there is no reason why the Council should not increase the budget to protect the Designated Sites fourfold to £35,661,792 so that a more credible set of mitigations can be implemented. This would increase the Tariff on each new dwelling to a mere £489, or 0.13% of the average purchase price.</p>	
55	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	<p>4.3 The cost has been worked out based on figures from February 2019. Before this strategy is accepted an increase in line with inflation will have to take place.</p> <p>Tariff 4.4: A tariff of £122.30 per new dwelling is being discussed as a way of paying for this mitigation strategy but (as I understand it), it is not currently adopted by all councils and therefore revenue is being lost.</p> <p>4.5: Have pay rises been factored into this cost, or does that come under the tariff being indexed linked? The contingency is already tight. What happens if not all the homes planned get built? Will fines contribute to the cost of the strategy going forward?</p> <p>4.12 I refer to a previous comment that LPA's are under pressure to provide housing numbers, thus, potentially, the tariff may not be collected if developers push back.</p>	<p>The final SPD will factor in inflation to reflect accurate costs at the time of adoption and index-linked (using Retail Price index (RPI)) to 2038. This includes salary pay rises, which are factored into the mitigation costs and not part of the 10% contingency. Contributions are already being collected by the LPAs. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The tariff will need to be paid before the commencement of the development in all cases and as a requirement of planning permission, unless alternative bespoke mitigation is delivered and agreed as suitable by Natural England. No amendment proposed.</p>
56	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	<p>The current tariff of £122.30 per dwelling is a minuscule proportion of the development cost of a new home and CPRE questions why the costed mitigation package (and resultant tariff) is therefore not larger. This could be affected by a phased or dual zoning - as evident in the Suffolk approach. It is therefore considered to be too simplistic an approach and</p>	<p>The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that has been calculated using the projected costs of mitigation and specifically in relation to in-combination recreational effects resulting from</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p> dwellings already consented in the Plan period - but where building has not already commenced - could surely be retrospectively included to provide a higher overall level of total contributions.</p> <p>It is reassuring that the RAMS contribution is in addition to the payment of any Community Infrastructure Levy or other form of developer contribution. Similar, it is right and proper that the LPAs legal costs associated with the drafting and checking of the deed are covered by the applicant and are in addition to the statutory planning application fee.</p>	<p>planned housing growth contained within the LPA's adopted or emerging Local Plans. Other mitigation can be expected to be delivered to address other effects identified on Habitats Sites to address the recommendations of project-level HRA/AAs. The tariff payment is in addition to any relevant CIL payments. No amendment proposed.</p>
57	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	I do not like this format - section by section.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.
58	Mr Gerald Sweeney	Carney Sweeney on behalf of Seven Capital (Chelmsford)	<p>Whilst the SPD seeks to provide a mechanism for how a RAMS contribution has been calculated and payable, we do not agree with the implementation of a 'blanket tariff' for a RAMS Contribution. The SPD proposes the collection of RAMS contribution through a Section 106 Agreement or Unilateral Undertaking.</p> <p>The proposed tariff of £122.30 per dwelling is in our opinion premature, as some developments may have less or more harm than others. As such, the implementation of a 'blanket tariff' does not take into account whether the planning obligation to secure the proposed RAMS contribution is necessary; directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind of development as required at Paragraph 56 of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is noted at Appendix 2 that a RAMS contribution in respect of Student Accommodation schemes is proposed to be applied on a 'proportionate basis'. From our reading of Appendix 2, it appears that part of the justification for this approach is due to such uses having an absence of car parking and the inability for students in purpose-built student accommodation to keep pets, and therefore, "... the increase in bird disturbance and associated bird mortality, will be less than dwelling</p>	<p>The RAMS and SPD applies only to 'in-combination effects' which have been identified within the HRAs of the LPAs' Local Plans. Each Local Plan's resultant AA and consultation with Natural England, has identified the need for the RAMS to mitigate in-combination effects and enable development.</p> <p>The Essex coast is unique and cannot be replicated. Evidence shows that residents living within the Zone of Influence visit the coast, thus the tariff is applicable to mitigate the effects of new housing growth.</p> <p>The tariff is evidence based and proportionate so as to not make new development unviable. It is considered inappropriate to apply a 'sliding-scale'</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>houses...". This approach demonstrates that there is an ability to make some concession for certain types of 'housing developments' depending on the nature of the use, but we would go further as matters relating to the location and sustainability credentials of a Site and the proposed scheme should also be taken into account.</p> <p>Therefore, we request that any contribution should be proportionate as to the degree of proven harm from a scheme, and in addition to this, where it is commercially viable for the scheme to make a RAMS contributions (over and above any CIL liability and other requests S106 contributions). As such, Paragraph 4.4. should be amended to include for the following:</p> <p>"Contributions from developments towards mitigation and measures identified in the Essex Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) will be sought against the identified harm of that scheme. The level of contribution will also be tested in the context of commercial viability of the overall scheme to avoid non-delivery of allocated sites."</p> <p>The basis for the RAMS contribution is noted as being to "... mitigate the additional recreational pressure in a way that ensures that those responsible for it, pay to mitigate it at a level consistent with the level of potential harm" (Paragraph 2.15 of the draft SPD).</p> <p>The payment of any RAMS contribution prior to commencement of development is therefore not deemed necessary as a scheme during the construction phase would not generate additional population. It is more appropriate that any RAMS contribution should be payable prior to the occupation of the development. and Paragraph 4.6 should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>in regard to the tariff at this stage and a 'blanket tariff' is proposed as the RAMS seeks to mitigate 'in-combination' effects i.e. those identified from accumulated housing growth in the ZoI. This can however be reviewed annually by the Delivery Officer once appointed. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>An amendment to the SPD setting out the requirements of development proposals in regard to statutory HRA procedures and on-site mitigation, and the specific effects the RAMS will mitigate in accordance with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations, is proposed.</p> <p>An amendment justifying the inclusion of C2 Residential Institutions and C2A Secure Residential Institutions as qualifying within the scope of tariff payments is proposed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6 of the SPD justifies that the tariff will be payable prior to commencement as 'this is necessary to ensure that the financial contribution is received with sufficient time for the mitigation to be put in place before any new dwellings are occupied.' Elements of the mitigation package, such as the appointment of staff, can take time to</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				implement. Others, such as surveying work, can only be undertaken at certain times of the year. It is considered important that mitigation relevant to the RAMS is delivered first, rather than potentially retrospectively, in order to ensure there is no possibility of harm resulting from development. No amendment proposed.

## Section Five – Alternative to paying into the RAMS

*Table 7 – Section Five: Summary of consultation responses and actions*

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	I'm concerned that there is a conflict of interest if the developers are contributing and in return this helps speed up the planning/approval process. Tight measures need to be in place.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	Mitigation or compensation? Local authorities are not aware of the distinction. Do you want to prevent damage or just feel better and kid yourself that you can recreate Habitat elsewhere? The fact that the Habitat does not occur naturally elsewhere should tell you that you can't mitigate or compensate.	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. The tariff can only legally be utilised to deliver the detailed mitigation included within the RAMS and reiterated within Appendix 1 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	I would rather trust council visitor data than applicants.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Aileen	Resident	RAMS seems a more pragmatic solution and should not offer an alternative.	Although the tariff is introduced, applicants may wish to propose

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Cockshott			bespoke mitigation as an alternative to the tariff, if it is deemed suitable by Natural England and the LPA. No amendment proposed.
5	Mrs Amy Gardener-Carr	Resident	Do not build here.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed. No amendment proposed.
6	Mrs Julie Waldie	Resident	Para 5.1 seems more sensible to me. Fairer and more cost effective too.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
7	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	I think a more inclusive survey would be necessary at this time. With the emphasis on what local households would prefer at this time and going forward for future generations. This would be prudent, whoever is paying for mitigation to take place.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr Brian Mills	Resident	The proposals look ok.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
9	Mrs Angela Harbottle	Resident	I agree developer contributions are the better option.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
10	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	It hardly seems likely that the developer will go to all the effort to perform visitor surveys in order to reduce the £122.30 payment. However, if they do attempt to do this before the dwellings are occupied it will under-represent the true figure. Many future residents will discover the full geography available to them and their dogs. So, both before and after occupation visitor surveys will under-represent the true wildlife disturbance situation.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. Alternatives must be

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				equal to or better than a payment of the RAMS tariff. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr John McCallum	Resident	My alternative to paying into RAMS is to not allow the developments in the first place.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed.
12	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Asking for money is not the answer it will make for resentment as it will not be used properly. Councils waste money.	The tariff can only legally be utilised to pay for the mitigation contained within the RAMS and included within Appendix 1 of the SPD. The RAMS project will be overseen by a working group lead by a newly appointed Delivery Officer. No amendment proposed.
13	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	All residents should be asked for comments on how they feel the wildlife would best be serviced.	A range of stakeholders were engaged during the preparation of the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
14	Cllr Malcolm Fincken	Halstead, Hedingham and District Branch Labour Party	We do not agree that an alternative to paying into the RAMS should be allowed. We consider that some developers may use this alternative as a way of avoiding the payments without showing any real commitment to the alternative.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Peter	Resident	They could instead build more houses at a cheaper cost, if they didn't have to pay an additional tax as this seems to be.	Noted. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Dervin			
16	Mr Neil Hargreaves	Resident	For c£100-ish per house no-one is going to bother paying for their own visitor survey.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Aubrey Cornell	Resident	All visitor surveys should be carried out by an independent, unbiased organisation.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
18	Mr Peter Bates	Resident	No. Seems reasonable.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
19	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	Any surveys must be peer assessed to prevent bias by a third party. Evidence must not be solely reliant on private parties and must include studies by relevant educational institutions (e.g. University).	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
20	Mr Graham Womack	Resident	This is a bad idea. The whole idea is to plan mitigation measures at a strategic level. Allowing developers to propose their own measures contradicts this and will be seen as a 'loophole' to include measures that only they will benefit from.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
21	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	Individual assessments should have some sort of national recognised certification otherwise unscrupulous developers will be able to bypass the requirements.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr Mark East	Resident	The above suggests that the proposals are in place to benefit applicants/developers and not the environment which the population are legally entitled to see protected.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
23	Mrs April Chapman	Resident	I cannot see any need to provide this alternative and see several drawbacks. It will delay schemes, cause court procedures where disputes occur which could add to local councils' costs and will engender resentments. It also encourages the idea that the RAMS mitigation system is flawed.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
24	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	Worth and cost needs to be viewed long term. Many possible benefits lost when only short-term effects taken into account.	It can be considered that this may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed. No amendment proposed.
25	Mr David Evans	Resident	Use concerned organisations to self-police.	It can be considered that this may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				of the SPD. No amendment proposed. No amendment proposed.
26	Mrs Karen Hawkes	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	P16.5 Alternative to paying into RAMS Point 5 should be removed. There should be no option for developers to carry out their own surveys. If the surveyor evidenced that there was no requirement to fund the tariff this would result in a shortfall in the anticipated income and as a result projects detailed may not be able to be funded. The tariff should be mandatory for all developments as identified and all applicants should be subjected to the same scrutiny.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
27	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	Town and Parish Councils could assist with surveys.	It can be considered that this may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed. No amendment proposed.
28	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	Would suggest the mitigation fee should be mandatory or not at all.  Any alternative choice would be too difficult to manage and involve long winded negotiations.  Mitigation is too big to be 'in house' (i.e. RAMS) Who elects the officers of RAMS? What authority do they have to raise a form of prohibition tax? What will RAMS do with the money raised?  Any mitigation scheme should be applied by government taxation for protection.	The RAMS responds to the requirement of the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs, that strategic mitigation is needed to ensure there would be no significant in-combination effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites at the Essex coast as a result of housing growth. The RAMS proposed a suite of mitigation measures that will be funded by the tariff contributions. This satisfies the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and is endorsed by Natural England. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				The provision of mitigation is mandatory for all proposing net new dwellings in the Zone of Influence. Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
29	Councillor Jenny Sandum	Braintree District Council	I am a bit concerned about applicants conducting their own visitors' surveys. I would prefer if an independent environmental conservation agency such as the Essex Wildlife Trust could be involved.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
30	Mrs Jackie Deane	Great Dunmow Town Council	No objection to the proposals.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
31	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	The alternative in 5.2 at least gives a slither of hope against this bird tax.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
32	Mrs Angela Faulds	Brentwood and Chelmsford Green Party	We hope this would be very vigorously monitored.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
33	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	I am not sure there should be an alternative to paying into RAMS as having consistency can often be the best policy as it allows for quicker modification to be introduced should the current adopted standards be	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			proven to fall short of what is required. Is it however currently accepted that paying into RAMS is an entrance fee to build and not an analysis prior to a decision that would ensure the inevitable damage that would occur when evaluated can be justified to future generations?	ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
34	Mr Mark Marshall	Resident	Progress can be positive as long as enforcement and funding is adequate.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
35	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	<p>We would agree that a "developer contribution" could be more cost-effective for an applicant than carrying out a visitor survey. A properly-conducted survey can be a time-consuming and expensive business, and so applicants might have to engage external consultants to carry out the work.</p> <p>This does not mean, however, that we support the imposition of a developer levy, when extra visitor access (and hence disturbance) to the coast is being actively encouraged by Natural England, and when some local authorities will be imposing a CIL charge on development projects as well.</p>	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. The SPD and RAMS ensures that residential development schemes within the Zone of Influence can come forward with an assurance that there will be no significant in-combination recreational effects on Habitats Sites on the Essex Coast. No amendment proposed.
36	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
37	Mrs Jenny Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Delete 5.2 - Do not support applicant/developer conducting their own visitor surveys.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff,

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
38	Mr James Taylor	Resident	No alternative route should be provided.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
39	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	Why would Natural England not be consulted on both scenarios? Natural England could then under-take an independent review of the HRA and the timings of the surveys.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.
40	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	This section is disconcerting, as despite the rigorous and consistent approach provided by the SPD, it also allows an applicant to take alternative action to secure bespoke mitigation to avoid impacts on Habitats sites. In spite of the identified mitigation measures provided by the costed package in Appendix 1, the provision for an applicant to negotiate alternatives to remain in perpetuity will involve considerably more time and cost for the Local Planning Authority (and English Nature). This should be reflected in the level of charge levied by the LPA on the applicant.	Developers have the option to conduct surveys to provide data to support any mitigation options they propose to ensure as an alternative to the tariff, however these must be approved by Natural England and be supported by a legally compliant HRA/AA at the project-level. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
41	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Six – Monitoring of this SPD

*Table 8 – Section Six: Summary of consultation responses and actions*

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	I think there should be an independent body monitoring the RAMS to ensure there is no conflict of interest and correct measures etc. are actually in place.	The RAMS project will be overseen by a working group and a Delivery Officer once appointed, a Steering Group, Project Board and elected members group. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	Monitoring is not conducted. Only enforcement after damage has been done. For example, at BANES council in Somerset, they state they do not monitor Mitigation and compliance in S.106 Agreements. What sort of Monitoring do you seriously think you can afford? You are an under-resourced small local authority with one tree officer. Try to be realistic.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. Monitoring will be undertaken by the project staff which will include a full-time Delivery Officer. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	Seems adequate.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Julie Waldie	Resident	Agree need to check this works. More checks the better.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
5	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	How will visit surveys be carried out? Also, will Essex residents be consulted on what is needed for local recreational needs and green and sustainable wild life needs? Future generations will not be able to self-monitor if they do not understand their local environment.	Visitor surveys will be carried out by the RAMS delivery team at the Essex Coast. Postcode data will be sought. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Brian Mills	Resident	What action will be taken if monitoring shows an unacceptable or irreversible situation.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. This may lead to

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				changes to the mitigation package proposed and possibly changes to the tariff. No amendment proposed.
7	Mrs Linda Samuels	Resident	Will the RSPB have a role within the monitoring process?	It can be considered that the finer details of the monitoring process may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer, but it is envisaged that the RSPB will have a role. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr David Kennedy	Resident	Explanation as to how this activity will be funded.	Further monitoring will be funded by the contributions collected through the RAMS project. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	This is good. But what action can they take with limited funds if they find mitigation is not working. Also, what about after 2038? I take it the residents will not be evicted and the houses demolished. Will any mitigations be surrendered, fences removed, and signs left to rust?	As the effects that the RAMS addresses are identified as occurring as a result of LPA Local Plans, the lifetime of the mitigation must reflect that of the Local Plan lifetimes, to 2038. As explained in the RAMS Strategy Document, an in-perpetuity fund will be developed to ensure that mitigation will be delivered in-perpetuity. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. This may lead to changes to the mitigation package proposed and possibly changes to the tariff. No amendment proposed.
10	Mr John McCallum	Resident	The monitoring process should include bodies like Essex Wildlife Trust who already have protected reserves on the coast.	It can be considered that the finer details of the monitoring process may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
11	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Monitoring and delivery officers-why? How?	The mitigation package identifies the need of a full-time RAMS Delivery Officer to oversee and manage the RAMS. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
12	Ms Rachel Cross	Resident	Monitoring of process needs to happen in year 3 as well or even annually as climate change gains momentum. How will wildlife be monitored?	The Essex Coast RAMS monitoring process, undertaken annually, will be used to inform future reviews of the RAMS and the SPD; therefore, any necessary changes will be made following this process. No amendment proposed.
13	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	Independent wildlife person should be involved.	It can be considered that the finer details of the monitoring process may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. No amendment proposed.
14	Ms Caroline Macgregor	Brightlingsea village councillor	Involvement of local town councils would better express the view of local people rather than district councils.	It can be considered that the finer details of the monitoring process may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	Parish wildlife groups and the RSPB must be consulted on any application and the RSPB must be compensated for their involvement.	Natural England are the statutory body that ensure the Habitats Regulations are met, as a consultee for HRA/AA documents. Other bodies are permitted to comment on all live planning applications. No amendment proposed.
16	Mr Peter Dervin	Resident	We don't have enough carers for our old and disabled, nurses in our hospitals, and in almost every other council funded field, but you are now finding the money for monitoring?	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				HRA/AAs. The SPD proposes a tariff to fund mitigation, and no other sources of funding will be used to ensure its delivery. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Alan Lycett	Resident	What happens to results of monitoring. If wildlife is to be protected effectively someone needs to have authority to take appropriate remediation.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. This may lead to changes to the mitigation package proposed and possibly changes to the tariff. No amendment proposed.
18	Mr Neil Hargreaves	Resident	This is an example of the bureaucratic cost of this scheme. Please just read how much work and staffing is in the paras above. Add to this the work at LPAs, including putting in Local Plans and doing the s106 requirement and collection and payment!	Noted. No amendment proposed.
19	Mr Andrew Whiteley	Resident	Monitoring should be set for every 2 years	The RAMS sets out that the visitor survey information is updated within the first two years of the Essex Coast RAMS adoption and repeated every 5 years afterwards to maintain postcode evidence of new residents and justifiable Zone of Influences. The Essex Coast RAMS package of measures will need to be prioritised and delivered on several timescales. The initial priorities will be reviewed by the Essex Coast RAMS Delivery Officer, however, once they are in post. No amendment proposed.
20	Mrs Angela McQuade	Resident	Please monitor closely and robustly.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Stephen	Resident	Any major structural changes must result in a public consultation process being repeated.	Any fundamental updates or revisions to the SPD resulting from future

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Ashdown			monitoring will be subject to consultation in line with the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) of each LPA. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr Michael Blackwell	Resident	This is a good checking system.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
23	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	I would like to see more regular scrutiny than annually.	Noted. A review of the monitoring arrangements proposed will be undertaken by the Delivery Officer, once appointed, as stated in Section 7.19 of the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
24	Mr Mark East	Resident	This all seems rather vague and lacking detail. The public cannot have confidence in its robust delivery.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
25	Mrs Michelle Endsor	Resident	This is paper pushing, meeting after meeting that is being funded when all that is needed is for proposed housing development to take place elsewhere other than an area of natural beauty that requires wildlife conservation, not destruction, not mitigation. There are many urban areas that have fallen into decay and require refurbishment or rebuilding and we would urge that these be utilised before destruction of the few historic wetlands that England has left	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed. The SPD relates to all residential development resulting in a net increase of new dwellings within the Zone of Influence, extending 22km from the coast. This includes many town centres across the county. No amendment proposed.
26	Mrs Linda	Resident	Once decision made the committee and its leader need to have the power to enforce or penalise.	Section 4.8 of the SPD sets out that if the tariff is not paid on qualifying

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Findlay			proposals, then planning permission would not be given. No amendment proposed.
27	Mr David Evans	Resident	<p>If monitoring this process and the sites, is anything like the level of evidence submitted in the report then this will be a worthless activity. I point the statement about the so-called damage being done to Hamford Water.</p> <p>1) it clearly states that there is Jet-Ski activity in Hamford Water and to contain this, the launching of Jet Skis will be prohibited by legislation at Titchmarsh Marina and in the area around Mill Lane in Walton. I would submit that there is no Jet-Ski activity in Hamford Water, the last one was seen several years ago, the launching of Jet-Skis is not permitted at Titchmarsh Marina or at the Walton &amp; Frinton Yacht Club or at the Walton Town Hard. The only place that Jet-Skis launch in this area is in Dovercourt Bay, which is a TDC designated small craft area. Additionally proscribing Jet-Skis totally is contrary to the United Nations Charter of the Seas and Freedom of Navigation to which the UK is a signatory. This applies to all coastal areas that do not dry out at low-tide.</p> <p>2) it states (without clearly identifying the precise location) that people walking on the salt-marsh in the south-eastern corner of Hamford Water, is causing significant damage. Whilst being unsure quite where this alleged activity is occurring, I visit Hamford Water on a daily basis and have done so for over 55 years, I have not seen any such activity and the only places of access in the south eastern area where the foreshore is accessible are at Island Lane and a very small area in Foundry Creek which is a designated industrial site. Even at these sites you would disappear in soft mud if such activity was tried.</p> <p>3) The document includes the Naze area, and states that this is part of the Nature Reserve and has issues with the effect of people going there especially with dogs off the lead, is seriously affecting the wildlife. It should be noted that this area is not controlled by Essex Wildlife Trust, it is</p>	Effects have been identified within the HRA/AAs of the LPAs Local Plans, regarding future growth, and the RAMS and SPD deals with recommended mitigation. The Essex Coast RAMS monitoring process will be used to inform future reviews of the RAMS and the SPD; therefore, any necessary changes will be made following the review process. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			owned by TDC, and was sold to Frinton and Walton UDC (TDC is the successor Council) by Essex County Council on the condition that it remained a Public Area with the public having complete freedom of access in perpetuity, plus banning dogs off the lead would cause a revolution. There never has been much in way of wildlife up there, a couple of Muntjac a few rabbits that have escaped the recent myxomatosis outbreak and a few gulls are about the sum total, nothing has changed there since I first visited the area on the first day it opened to the public in the 1950s after the MoD vacated it.	
28	Mrs Karen Hawkes	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	P17 6.3 Steering Group - This should include relevant partners as detailed in table 4.1 including as proposed previously in this sub-mission in respect of page 12 above. With reference to the steering group, members would welcome a representative from all partnership organisations as detailed on P13 with the addition of Town and Parish Councils. As currently stipulated in the plan there is no input from RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust and Town and Parish Councils.	It can be considered that the points made may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
29	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	Will the general public be able to view the monitoring data?  Monitoring data should be transparent to enable the community directly affected by the disturbance of their designated habitats to be alerted to over sights or lack of proper data.  If to be included this section should inform the public where this info will be available to view and where to raise the alert if the data is not sufficient or available.	All monitoring data will be made publicly available. No amendment proposed.
30	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	Town and Parish Councils could be involved in the monitoring process.	It can be considered that this point may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
31	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	There are plenty of groups who do this such as Essex Wildlife Trust.	It can be considered that this point may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
32	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton- on-the-Naze) Ltd	RAMS will be yet another organisation on top of the existing 31 organisations.  who monitor the care of the designated areas. The proposed scheme is purely to raise money for mitigating purposes. The scheme is so complicated, layered and requiring a large army of enforcers to be employed, meaning that raised for mitigation will simply be used up in salaries. This is just creating jobs for the boys.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
33	Mr John Fletcher	Resident	The area is already well monitored by Environment Agency, Natural England, RSPB and MMO. How many more monitors do we want?	The effectiveness of the specific mitigation proposed will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. The effectiveness of the RAMS is not currently monitored by any other party. No amendment proposed.
34	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowlers Association	Regarding paragraph 6.4, the BWA maintains a record of all visits by members to its sites. The BWA also places limits on the number of visitors allowed per site, frequency and overall numbers within the organisation. Through this we have managed to maintain a fairly consistent level of activity, which is judged to minimise disturbance while balancing the demands of our members.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
35	Mr Mark Nowers	RSPB	The RSPB would welcome being part of the RAMS Steering Group (section 6.3).	The Delivery Officer and Rangers can explore joint working arrangements, once appointed. No amendment required.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
36	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	<p>How can this project have any measurable outcome?</p> <p>Maybe the RSPB will arrange huge catch nets, usually triggered by loud explosives, to tangle up and capture hundreds of birds, then weigh them, tag them, and note down that they seem happy having not been disturbed due to RAMS.</p>	<p>A strategic monitoring process is proposed to be put in place and will be managed by a dedicated RAMS delivery officer in liaison with each LPA's own monitoring officers. No amendment proposed.</p>
37	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	<p>It is essential that the effectiveness of the RAMS and this SPD, a strategic monitoring process is in place and will be managed by a dedicated RAMS delivery officer in liaison with each LPA's own monitoring officers.</p> <p>One problem is that it is reactive with Monitoring only taking place annually and the report being provided to each LPA to inform their individual Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). Also, I fear it will become another meeting someone has to attend like buses or highways as long as the box is ticked that is OK. Who will be responsible for activating fit for purpose checks and be responsible for the results if less than satisfactory? A lot can happen in five years, once bad habits can become the acceptable norms. It is common to have personnel progress as part of a career path so how do you intend to create a responsive environment within the group. Does responsibility stay within the group or stay with the decision makers? It does not help you build any trust when individuals, communes or travellers move onto a site in a Ramsar areas and years later are still there playing the planning system</p>	<p>It can be considered that this point may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. A strategic monitoring process is proposed to be put in place and will be managed by a dedicated RAMS delivery officer in liaison with each LPA's own monitoring officers. No amendment proposed.</p>
38	Mr Mark Marshall	Resident	<p>A lot can happen in a year, 6 monthly monitoring should be considered.</p>	<p>The RAMS sets out that the visitor survey information is updated within the first two years of the Essex Coast RAMS adoption and repeated every 5 years afterwards to maintain postcode evidence of new residents and justifiable Zone of Influences. The Essex Coast RAMS package of measures will need to be prioritised and delivered on several timescales. The initial priorities will be reviewed by</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				the Essex Coast RAMS Delivery Officer, however, once they are in post. No amendment proposed.
39	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	<p>As pointed out above, extra recreational access to the Essex coast will be encouraged and facilitated by the delivery of the England Coast Path by Natural England. This will inevitably increase disturbance to habitats and resident and migratory bird species, regardless of the extent of any development in the area. In some sections of the coast, there will now be formalised recreational access for walkers and dogs where hitherto there has been no public access.</p> <p>It is hoped that monitoring will have regard to this and will not lay responsibility for the effects of increased access solely at the door of landowners and developers.</p>	The SPD is related only to those in-combination recreational impacts identified through the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
40	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
41	Mrs Jenny Clemo	Langford & Ulting Parish Council	Monitoring should be after 1 year and subsequently every 2 years.	The RAMS sets out that the visitor survey information is updated within the first two years of the Essex Coast RAMS adoption and repeated every 5 years afterwards to maintain postcode evidence of new residents and justifiable Zone of Influences. The Essex Coast RAMS package of measures will need to be prioritised and delivered on several timescales. The initial priorities will be reviewed by the Essex Coast RAMS Delivery Officer, however, once they are in post. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
42	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	6.1 Will the RAMS Officer be truly independent of the LPA's? 6.2 Will the annual report be submitted to independent bodies, such as RSPB and EWT? 6.3 EWT are not part of the steering group and they are present at Abberton Reservoir which is a key site for birds. General Comment: Similar schemes have been created in other parts of the country, but they haven't been running long enough to ascertain if these schemes actually work.	It can be considered that this point may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. A strategic monitoring process is proposed to be put in place and will be managed by a dedicated RAMS delivery officer in liaison with each LPA's own monitoring officers. The Delivery Officer will be employed by one of the partner LPAs and engage with key local stakeholders once appointed. The RAMS annual report will be published. No amendment proposed.
43	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Seven - Consultation

*Table 9 – Section Seven: Summary of consultation responses and actions*

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	There's not enough detail to comment at this stage. I need to understand what areas could be affected, what is actually being done to mitigate. If there is a breeding season, then possibly pathways need to be closed off etc.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	There should be no development that will lead to more disturbance of European protected sites.	The principle of the RAMS and the SPD ensures that in-combination recreational effects will not be realised

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				on the Essex Coast's Habitats Sites as a result of residential development. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	It is important to maintain the wildlife. Mitigation of damage is vital, and I think the suggestions are good for a code, designated paths etc.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Amy Gardener-Carr	Resident	Why is this even being considered with growing flood concerns, destruction of habitat of wildlife.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed. The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
5	Rev. Ian Scott-Thompson	Resident	These consultations seem designed for planning professionals. The language and response format are difficult for ordinary residents to use.	Where technical terminology and acronyms are used, these are defined in the SPD. Efforts have been made to ensure that the SPD is clear and minimises the use of jargon. An abbreviations list is also provided. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	I wonder what the environmental charities Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Essex Wildlife Trust etc have to say about this plan. The excessive use of acronyms makes these documents hard to read.	The RSPB and EWT have been invited for comment as part of the consultation. Where technical terminology and acronyms are used, these are defined in the SPD. Efforts have been made to ensure that the SPD is clear and minimises the use of

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				jargon. An abbreviations list is also provided. No amendment proposed.
7	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	The subject of Ecology/Environment Care should be started as soon as a child starts to read.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	I think it is great that the general public are consulted for their views. However, the papers are extensive to read and not many people will find the time to read them. I would have felt it would have been better to do this as a survey with suggestions and tick boxes to obtain people's' view, with a section at the end for additional comments.	Where technical terminology and acronyms are used, these are defined in the SPD. Efforts have been made to ensure that the SPD is clear and minimises the use of jargon. An abbreviations list is also provided. No amendment proposed.
9	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	This consultation should have been widely advertised in papers and local communities.	Noted. The consultation was conducted in line with national Regulations and LPA Statements of Community Involvement. A Public Notice was placed in the Essex Chronicle. No amendment proposed.
10	Ms Caroline Macgregor	Resident	This consultation should have been more widely publicised by alerts and newspaper and radio articles.	Noted. The consultation was conducted in line with national Regulations and LPA Statements of Community Involvement. A Public Notice was placed in the Essex Chronicle. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr Alan Lycett	Resident	The SPD is a very high-level document. It needs to be converted into a more detailed document so that important features such as metrics can be added.	Noted. Further detail is provided in the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	All sections are clear but it seems likely that outside pressures to ignore some of the rules will occur.	The RAMS and SPD will be subject to annual monitoring regarding effectiveness, as outlined in Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
13	Mr Peter Bates	Resident	I consider that the letter informing residents about this consultation is designed not to encourage responses: it was not written with anyone except Planners or Solicitors in mind. It is necessary to scroll down to see	Noted. LPAs will seek to ensure that future consultation notifications are as

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			the entire text - many people will not realise the full extent of the document they are answering questions on.	clear as possible. No amendment proposed.
14	Mr Graham Womack	Resident	When is the SPD expected to be implemented? How will it be applied retrospectively to the Local Plans that are currently out for consultation?	The SPD is expected to be adopted by each authority by Summer 2020. The collection of the tariff by partner LPAs has been ongoing since the emergence of the RAMS document in 2018/19.
15	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	The consultation did not seem to be too well advertised. It has also asked me for a lot of personal information, and I cannot see anything telling me how data will be used as per GDPR.	Noted. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with each authority's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and was advertised accordingly. No personal information will be published and it will be kept by Place Services only for the purposes of notifying respondents on the progression of the SPD. The 'Statement of Representations' includes details on how comments will be used and GDPR. The consultation was conducted in line with national Regulations and LPA Statements of Community Involvement. A Public Notice was placed in the Essex Chronicle. No amendment proposed.
16	Councillor Richard van Dulken	Braintree District Council	Local Authority and related documents never seem to have summaries of the contents, to avoid the need to plough through page after page, and in the case of this consultation, document after document.	Sections 2 and 3 of the SPD provide summaries of the RAMS and scope of the SPD. Additionally, the SPD signposts a 'frequently asked questions' (FAQ) document' which is available on the Bird Aware Essex Coast website. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
17	Mr Mark East	Resident	The consultation lacks evidence of data collected to date to formulate this should be made available for transparency purposes.	The RAMS document, signposted within the SPD and linked within the consultation portal, includes the data collected in formulating the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
18	Mr. David Gollifer	Resident	Satisfactory.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
19	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	Give feedback. Justify decision made relating to consultation points. Do not allow repeated consultations to delay positive decisions.	This 'You Said We Did' report intends to justify decisions made related to points raised during the consultation. No amendment proposed.
20	Mr Barrie Ellis	Resident	No amendments proposed. The document is clear.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr David Evans	Resident	We believe the spending of tax-payers money to impose restrictions on the lawful and peaceful use of this very unique area is totally unwarranted and may even prove to be counterproductive. If it is bird life you are concerned about, I strongly suggest that you look at the Hamford Waters Bird surveys conducted by the Warden, these show consistent healthy increases, it should also be questioned why the EA licence the blowing of eggs of the Lesser Black Backed Gull on Hedge End Island, or is it that only certain parts of the natural world are to be allowed to blossom?	The RAMS and SPD relate to future planned growth, and the recreational impact that housing can be expected to have across the 12 partner LPAs. Current conditions act as a baseline against which future effects and mitigation can be identified. No amendments proposed.
22	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	This Essex Coast RAMS Supplementary Planning Document was not sufficiently promoted. It was only by word of mouth that this document has been circulated. This scheme is unnecessary, unworkable and dictatorial.	The RAMS and SPD have been identified as required through compliance with EU law, namely the 'Habitats Directive' and 'Birds Directive'. The consultation was conducted in line with national Regulations and LPA Statements of Community Involvement. A Public Notice was placed in the Essex Chronicle. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
23	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowlers Association	In principle we support the objectives of SPD. We limit disturbance in two ways first by limiting the numbers in our organisation and secondly by minimising public access to our wetlands by appropriate signs.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
24	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	I look forward to my comments being considered properly, as at every stage of the process so far, concerns of anyone other those with a vested interest in the project, have fallen on deaf ears.	Noted. All comments received to the consultation will be considered and used to inform the final SPD. More details will be set out within a 'You Said We Did' document. No amendment proposed.
25	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	The consultation system is reasonably easy to work through.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
26	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
27	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	<p>Will the comments taken from the NEGC Inspector Review Workshops in January 2020 also be taken into account? Points that were made include: Other RAMS that exist in the country are new and mitigation measures have not been tried and tested due to their infancy / The RAMS are based on soft measures / The bye-laws will need to be updated as they are out of date as they look at things like vessel speeds / There is no code of conduct at present for clubs that organise water sports such as paragliding / Rangers will need to interact with users and the zones of interest are under-estimated / Paragliding, one of the worst offenders for bird disturbance, is a niche activity and it can be tourists to the area that have the worst impact, not the housing itself.</p> <p>Natural England wanted to be an independent body for wildlife, but the last coalition government told them they couldn't be truly independent and thus mitigation strategies were born rather than protecting areas on interest from development. RSPB has not endorsed this particular</p>	<p>The Essex Coast RAMS has been accepted by the Inspector who examined the Chelmsford Local Plan. It can be considered that the points made may be addressed if appropriate through the actions of the Delivery Officer. The SPD sets out a funding mechanism for the delivery of the mitigation included within the RAMS.</p> <p>Regarding effectiveness of the mitigation, Section 6 of the SPD outlines monitoring arrangements of the SPD and the RAMS. This will, alongside other monitoring requirements of the LPAs, cover</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			scheme, although it has been asked to be part of the steering group. What if not all the housing supply comes forward and the strategy is left in a deficit position? You cannot replace what is lost. The Essex Coast RAMS may take time to implement and thus developers will get their planning permission through before they have to contribute. The tariff per dwelling may need to change.	housing delivery. The tariff may be liable to change over time to ensure effective mitigation can be delivered.  The RSPB are not members of the Steering Group.  No amendments proposed.
28	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Eight – Useful Links

*Table 10 – Section Eight: Summary of consultation responses and actions*

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	Useful links are not enough. I want to see a summary which details the current issue, what the high-level mitigation proposals are, what they are going to cost, how long it's going to take etc. A simple excel spreadsheet/ some visual aid would be very helpful.	It is considered that RAMS and SPD sufficiently summarises the issue, outlines strategic mitigation and its cost, and the timelines for the delivery of the mitigation. No amendment proposed.
2	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	Remember horse riders. We share access with those who do not understand horses and risk (loose dogs - also a risk to wildlife but no enforcement on requirement for leads). There is a concern that the RAMS would lead to a loss of places to ride.	Noted. There are no proposals in the RAMS to remove bridleways. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Aileen Cockshott	Resident	Are the RSPB involved in this process?	The RSPB were invited to both of the preliminary workshops essential to devising the RAMS and the RSPB

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				<p>provided valuable support for the RAMS and BirdAware. Only the partner LPAs and Natural England were involved in the steering group as the RAMS and SPD are considered technical Local Plan documents.</p> <p>The RAMS toolkit states that, for the 'Habitat based measures' Action Area, partnership working may include such organisations as 'Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, landowners, local clubs and societies.' No amendment proposed.</p>
4	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	The bird aware website is useful.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
5	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Ensure nature awareness in schools.	Noted. This can be considered by the Delivery Officer once in post. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	As a bird watcher I visit these areas on a regular basis and population levels have already reached unsustainable levels. At certain times of the day roads in and out of these areas are impassable and restricted areas of parking mean an increase in traffic noise and pollution to local residents.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
7	Mr Gary Freeman	Resident	RSPB should be on the list.	The RSPB were invited to both of the preliminary workshops essential to devising the RAMS and the RSPB provided valuable support for the RAMS and BirdAware. Only the partner LPAs and Natural England were involved in the steering group as



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				<p>the RAMS and SPD are considered technical Local Plan documents.</p> <p>The RAMS toolkit states that, for the 'Habitat based measures' Action Area, partnership working may include such organisations as 'Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, landowners, local clubs and societies.' No amendment proposed.</p>
8	Mr Alan Lycett	Resident	Suggest you consider including other stakeholders involved in the protection of wildlife. For example, RSPB; do not stop with the obvious local stakeholders.	<p>The RSPB were invited to both of the preliminary workshops essential to devising the RAMS and the RSPB provided valuable support for the RAMS and BirdAware. Only the partner LPAs and Natural England were involved in the steering group as the RAMS and SPD are considered technical Local Plan documents.</p> <p>The RAMS toolkit states that, for the 'Habitat based measures' Action Area, partnership working may include such organisations as 'Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, landowners, local clubs and societies.' No amendment proposed.</p>
9	Mr John Camp	Resident	Essex Wildlife Trust and RSPB should be added.	<p>The RSPB were invited to both of the preliminary workshops essential to devising the RAMS and the RSPB provided valuable support for the RAMS and BirdAware. Only the</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				<p>partner LPAs and Natural England were involved in the steering group as the RAMS and SPD are considered technical Local Plan documents.</p> <p>The RAMS toolkit states that, for the 'Habitat based measures' Action Area, partnership working may include such organisations as 'Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, landowners, local clubs and societies.' No amendment proposed.</p>
10	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	Should also contain details of Essex County Council and how the problem can be escalated.	Essex County Council sit on the Steering Group of the RAMS to provide advice and guidance. ECC are not a partner in the RAMS as it is the LPAs who are responsible for preparing, adopting, delivering and implementing the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr Mark East	Resident	The links are top level perhaps they should link to RAMS elements.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
12	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	Utilise environmentalist knowledge and advice, e.g. Tony Juniper author of 'What has nature ever done for us?' This includes positive practical action to protect coasts.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
13	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	Very helpful links.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
14	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	Link to the Environment Agency?	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
15	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	These sites are easy to find.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
16	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	The wildlife of the Essex Coast is threatened by the increase in population in the Zone of Influence and this aspect is controlled by the Planning Committees of these links.	Planning Officers from each LPA within the Zone of Influence have been involved within the process of the RAMS and the SPD through attendance of a RAMS Steering Group. It is expected that the SPD will be adopted by each authority by Summer 2020. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	I could not readily see any link to any empirical justification of the whole RAMS idea. Also, no link to studies by people like Professor John Goss-Custard whose talks and papers titled Mud, Birds and Poppycock make enlightening reading.	Justification to the RAMS and the SPD can be found within the Local Plan HRA/AAs of each partner LPA. No amendment proposed.
18	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	Very useful both for this consultation and future reference.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
19	Mr Steven Smith	Comments offered on behalf of: Lower Farm, East End Green, Brightlingsea	Reference should be made to the England Coast Path (ECP). Natural England have started to investigate how to improve coastal access along an 81 km stretch of the Essex coast between Salcott and Jaywick. This new access is expected to be ready in 2020. Officers from Essex County Council have provided Natural England with expert local advice and helped to make sure there is full consultation with local interests during the development of the route which is expected to be published later this year.	The Essex Coast Path proposal, and any effects on recreational disturbance, are not within the scope of the mitigation proposed in the RAMS and the SPD. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
20	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is not listed here.	The content of the NPPF is effectively covered in the 'Planning Practice Guidance' link, however an amendment to include the NPPF within this Section is proposed.
22	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	The DEFRA Magic Map tool is slow to load, difficult to navigate and functionally complex. It was not possible to find the definitive Zones of Influence mapping - as indicated in Section 3 of the consultation document - despite several attempts.	It is proposed that the RAMS, SPD and this 'You Said, We Did' report are offered to DEFRA. No amendment proposed.
23	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Nine - Glossary

**Table 11 – Section Nine: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	This section does not add any substance and could be shown as another "link"	Noted. No amendment proposed.
2	Mr Bob Tyrrell	West Bergholt Parish Council	Ok.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
3	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	I suspect that national guidelines and certain bodies could override local concerns and needs. Has Essex now become linked to the National Coast Path, and is it widely published, and the route signposted? It is correct to	The SPD is related only to those recreational impacts identified through

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			have all interested organisations to monitor the mitigation, but it could generate conflicts of interest.	the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs. No amendment proposed.
4	Mr Brian Mills	Resident	Looks good	Noted. No amendment proposed.
5	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	High schools and colleges should be given charts and information.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
6	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	I wished you had not used the abbreviations throughout the document as there are many abbreviations which makes it harder to follow reading the documents.	An amendment to move the glossary and list of abbreviations to front of the SPD is proposed, with added description explained in footnotes where necessary and newly introduced.
7	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	Aircraft fuel dumping and fumes and shooting of birds needs to be looked at, you are trying to make a better place but at the same time killing birds and also harming them with aviation fuel.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Ms Caroline Macgregor	Brightlingsea village councillor	Local people do not wish to see the further development of rural Essex as a part of the Haven Gateway to accommodate London overspill. The impact on human health as well as birds and wildlife from pollution will be catastrophic. Local monies would be better spent on conserving our coastline and preparing for rising sea levels.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr Alan Lycett	Resident	Presumably this is a living document so additional information may be added to this and other sections. Need to ensure document management standards are visible on each section/ page.	The RAMS is a living document and will be reviewed annually and updated accordingly. Should any subsequent amendment to the RAMS lead in turn to a need for an amendment to the SPD, this will be forthcoming. An amendment to move the glossary and list of abbreviations to front of the SPD is proposed, with added description explained in footnotes where

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				necessary and newly introduced. No amendment proposed.
10	Mr Stephen Ashdown	Resident	Needs to be written in plain English, wording again is not inclusive of people of every educational level.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr Mark East	Resident	This section appears to be ok.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr. David Gollifer	Resident	Satisfactory.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
13	Mrs Dawn Afriyie	Resident	Many rare bird species have seen in the last few months on the Essex coast. These birds will disappear when our coastal land is built on, having an impact on all the other wildlife. No more building.	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed. The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
14	Mr Graham Pike	Resident	Very useful.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. owner of 1.5	Let nature take its own course, it always wins.	Noted. No amendment proposed.

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
		miles of river banks of the crouch		
16	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	Now the U.K is no longer a member of the E.U it will no longer have to comply with the E.U directives and can now take back control to suit its own requirements?	The content of the relevant EU Directives related to birds and habitats have been transposed into UK law and will continue to apply. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowlers Association	Might it be worth noting 'A Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is a formal conservation designation' within the UK. Activities within SSSIs are subject to regulatory control.	An amendment to include SSSIs within the Glossary is proposed.
18	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	The list of designations is not complete.	An amendment to include SSSIs within the Glossary is proposed.
19	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	Always useful to have a reference.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
20	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	The Zones of Influence are defined in the Glossary as "the distance within which new residents are likely to travel to the Essex coast Habitats sites for recreation". Given the comments provided in Section 3 and 4 above, perhaps a more subtle graded Zone of Influence framework is more appropriate (such as Zones A & B in the equivalent Suffolk model). This would better reflect proximity to coast, centres of growing population and accessibility variables rather than a simplified single Zone.	The RAMS sets out how the Zone of Influence was calculated, including using visitor surveys. Questions asked of visitors to the SPA locations were designed to collect data on the reasons for visits as well as postcodes to evidence Zones of Influence. Additional surveys will improve the robustness of the datasets and repeat surveys of visitors will be undertaken at the earliest opportunity to review the

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				postcode data and Zone of Influence. No amendment proposed.
22	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Section Ten - Acronyms

*Table 12 – Section Ten: Summary of consultation responses and actions*

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	Put your acronyms at the beginning of this consultation not at the end. Also, a search button would probably be more useful or an icon to click on for the acronym, glossary etc. This needs to be made easier for residents to read and fully understand.	It is proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	SPA, SAR, SSSI, Ramsar - all apply to the Essex coast. Why damage it further?	All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. No amendment proposed.



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
3	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	Acronyms are ok if they are known by the people who need to access the information. Most of the general public would not now what they represent.	It is proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD.
4	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	No acronyms should be used if you want to engage the public. They are only useful for the writers.	Acronyms have been used throughout the SPD for the purposes of conciseness. It is proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD.
5	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	The acronym 'AA' means many things to many people. Instead of the acronym 'RAMS' why not just say care of environment? The 'Zone of Influence' is a zone -not an area.	Acronyms have been used throughout the SPD for the purposes of conciseness. It is proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD.
6	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	RSPB must be consulted.	<p>The RSPB were invited to both of the preliminary workshops essential to devising the RAMS and the RSPB provided valuable support for the RAMS and BirdAware. Only the partner LPAs and Natural England were involved in the steering group as the RAMS and SPD are considered technical Local Plan documents.</p> <p>The RAMS toolkit states that, for the 'Habitat based measures' Action Area, partnership working may include such organisations as 'Natural England, Environment Agency, RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust, National Trust, landowners,</p>



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				local clubs and societies.' No amendment proposed.
7	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	It is general practice to explain new terms and afterwards use an abbreviation, but this does not make complex documents easy to read.	Acronyms have been used throughout the SPD for the purposes of conciseness. It is proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD.
8	Mr Mark East	Resident	They appear to be fine. I have noted that this document does not appear to deal with compensation. I do not share the view that these measures will reasonably mitigate against harm let alone avoid harm. I do accept that these are challenging times with housing targets set by central Government, but I am not convinced that these measures will ultimately prevent the deterioration in numbers of our protected species and eventual end of some.	The Essex Coast RAMS SPD sets out a tariff that will be used to fund mitigation related to 'in-combination' recreational effects only. Other mechanisms and requirements exist outside the scope of the SPD for other required and related mitigation. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr. David Gollifer	Resident	All OK.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
10	Councillor Roy Martin	Resident	Acronyms should never be used.	Acronyms have been used throughout the SPD for the purposes of conciseness. It is proposed that the Acronym section is moved to the beginning of the SPD.
11	Mr Graham Pike	Resident	Very useful.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
12	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	Very good to see the acronyms defined.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
13	Mr Roy	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor,	I have seen many surveys in the past, and I am sure there will be more in future.	Noted. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Hart	Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch		
14	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	The list of acronyms is not complete.	It is proposed to expand the list of Acronyms included within this Section to reflect all of those used in the SPD and RAMS.
15	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	I am sure many people will have found them useful as the same groups of letters re-occur in many different disciplines relating to different policies, documents etc.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
16	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	NPPF not detailed here and the list seems short.	It is proposed to expand the list of Acronyms included within this Section.
17	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Appendix 1 - Strategic Mitigation

**Table 13 – Appendix One: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	This does not seem like a lot of people for such a large area. Maybe you should consider asking for volunteers in those areas. Also, selling some merchandise around the protection of the birds etc. to re-coup costs. Also, you mention the per tariff cost, but I have no idea how that supports the above table of costs.	Volunteers may be sought, and other enterprises explored, if deemed necessary by the Delivery Officer. The tariff cost per dwelling has been calculated by dividing the costed mitigation package by the number of



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				unconsented dwellings earmarked for delivery in Local Plan periods by each LPA. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	There is research showing that mitigation does not work.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	What about holiday/maternity cover etc? Is one ranger enough to cover a wide area and deal with enforcement?	Holiday and maternity cover will be funded by the competent authorities and their terms of service. A total of three rangers are proposed within the lifespan of the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Aileen Cockshott	Resident	Think there is more to this than signage. Admiralty charts and OS maps with require an update.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
5	Mrs Anne Wild	Resident	I have been impressed with all I've read so far. However, would it be possible to create - with the agreement of landowners where applicable - new bird reserves, with access only available through membership? Membership revenue could be divided between the organisation/rangers etc needed (also funded by RAMS) and the landowner.	A total of £500,000 is included within the packaged costs for habitat creation in key locations where it would provide benefits and work up projects. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	Whilst some form of mitigation officers are needed, value for money must be monitored.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
7	Mrs Angela Harbottle	Resident	Not qualified to comment but seems to be a great deal of money.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Mr David Kennedy	Resident	Salary of water bailiffs appears to be high, this should be explained.	Salaried costs have been identified by exploring the costs of similar existing roles. The costs



## APPENDIX 3





No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				for the water rangers also include training, maintenance and byelaws costs. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr Charles Joynson	Resident	Too little overall to mitigate such a long coastline.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
10	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	This is a total waste of money and energy. I will need to ask our MP to look at this.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
11	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	Explain how these figures are arrived at.	The RAMS gives more detail regarding the costed mitigation package. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr Peter Dervin	Resident	Please put the money in to employing people in positions that are so much more needed, for example health care assistants and nurses.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
13	Mr Neil Hargreaves	Resident	Does the package include the cost of each LPA's own monitoring officers?	The mitigation package does not include the staffing costs of each LPA's monitoring officers. No amendment proposed.
14	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	I am pleased to see an annual training budget.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
15	Mrs Angela McQuade	Resident	Surveys are too expensive.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
16	Mr Stephen	Resident	The package does not include possible income streams to assist in payment.	The mitigation package is itemised to ensure mitigation is in



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Ashdown			conformity to Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. No amendment proposed.
17	Mr Mark East	Resident	Costs and staffing levels seem inadequate.	The RAMS gives more detail regarding the costed mitigation package. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
18	Mrs April Chapman	Resident	Has visitor use of drones been considered? One ranger is not enough. Two should be a minimum from the start of the scheme to ensure daily cover.	Two rangers have been included from Year 2 of the project. The RAMS seeks to mitigate future growth and does not directly seek to address the baseline position as it would not be appropriate. The use of drones may be considered by the Delivery Officer, if appropriate, and once in post. No amendment proposed.
19	Mrs Karen Hawkes	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	Whilst members are supportive of the Action Areas identified, there are concerns as to whether they are deliverable within the budget identified. Mitigation package is £8,916,448 from March 2019 – 2038. Members suggest that the toolkit needs revisiting to ensure that the projects can be delivered within the budget available. They also identified that there is excessive funding on personnel and enforcement and insufficient funding on the delivery of actual projects. Members are also concerned that the type of projects proposed are already being delivered by other stakeholders and that this is an unnecessary duplication of work.	The RAMS gives more detail regarding the costed mitigation package. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
20	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	The statement, "some of the survey costs may be absorbed into the budget for the HRAs needed for Local Plans. This could reduce the amount of contributions secured via RAMS which could be used for alternative measures" is a worrying statement. This money should not be available for the HRA's as it will diminish the good work that can be done.	The statement quoted is intended to be interpreted that Local Plan HRA work could cover the costs of the survey should there be any need to undertake such survey work as part of those processes.



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>Regarding work with landowners, Habitats site managers &amp; partner organisations - I hope you will also be working with the local community and empowering them to get involved and learn more about the habitats they live near thereby fostering the love of nature required for the future.</p> <p>I am concerned that giving planning permission for inappropriate development in the wrong place could now be seen as a way to make this mitigation package money for local councils. How will you stop this happening? How will over enthusiastic planning granting be avoided and mitigated against?</p>	<p>This would not lead to a shortfall in RAMS mitigation, as the survey work has been costed for in the package. It would however lead to a small reduction in the tariff as the survey work would already have been undertaken.</p> <p>Locational criteria for development are a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. No amendment proposed.</p>
21	Mr Graham Pike	Resident	A very helpful breakdown of the project, costs and ambitions.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
22	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	It may have been appropriate to mention some of these strategies earlier in the document as examples as to what types of mitigation - in practical terms - will be required.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
23	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. Owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	This money could really be spent on other projects, such as roads and sheltered housing for the homeless.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. No amendment proposed.
24	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	The mitigation package is totally unmanageable and must be the biggest waste of public money ever designed. What is a delivery officer? What does a ranger do? Who / what organisation is going to do training? What is the Partner Executive Group to do? What are new interpretation boards? How can visitor	The SPD sets out a funding mechanism for the RAMS in the form of a tariff to be paid by developers proposing net new



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			numbers be recorded? Who are Rangers? Who is / or how many delivery officers are required? Where will there be a Water Ranger? Is the Tendring District Council Warden to be axed to make savings for the rate payer?	dwelling in the Zone of Influence. The RAMS will not be funded by any other means. The RAMS sets out the roles of the newly created posts that are required to deliver mitigation. The precise nature and location of certain mitigation measures e.g. interpretation boards and training will be decided by the Delivery Officer and project Steering Group who have day to day responsibility for delivering the project. No amendment proposed.
25	Mr John Fletcher	Resident	The whole scheme is a diabolical waste of money. It serves no useful purpose. To say that people living within the Zone of Influence cause a problem is salacious. Why should they be asked to pay for all when most visitors come from outside the Zone? Maybe you should spend some money to encourage your 'experts' to come and actually live at the coast for a prolonged period. They may then know what they are talking about. We, who live and work on the coast appreciate and work with nature on a daily basis. Every day we note increases in wildlife on the coast - all this takes place without interference from human bureaucrats.	The SPD sets out a funding mechanism for the RAMS in the form of a tariff to be paid by developers proposing net new dwellings in the Zone of Influence. It is concerned with the effects of new housing development only. The RAMS sets out strategic mitigation to ensure no significant effects regarding recreational disturbance are realised on Habitats Sites in the Essex Coast. No amendment proposed.
26	Mr Hugh Toler	Blackwater Wildfowling Association	The BWA notes the employment of Rangers for monitoring and briefing clubs on codes of conduct. Has consideration been given to using trained volunteers from Clubs such as ours with a knowledge of wetlands, wildfowl and habitat protection?	Volunteers may be sought if deemed necessary by the Delivery Officer but no itemised cost has been identified. No amendment proposed.
27	Mr Mark	RSPB	The ten SPAs around the Essex coast support approximately half a million wintering waterbirds and important assemblages of breeding birds. Over	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined



## APPENDIX 3





No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Nowers		<p>72,000 dwellings are due to be built before 2038.</p> <p>The Bird Aware Solent project covered three SPAs supporting 90,000 birds. 64,000 dwellings are due to be built before 2034. In the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, Bird Aware Solent has identified that a team of rangers is the top priority followed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications, marketing and education initiatives</li> <li>• Initiatives to facilitate and encourage responsible dog walking</li> <li>• Codes of conduct</li> <li>• Site-specific visitor management and bird refuge projects</li> <li>• New/enhanced strategic greenspaces</li> <li>• A delivery officer (called 'Partnership Manager' from here on)</li> <li>• Monitoring to help adjust the mitigation measures as necessary</li> </ul> <p>To that end, they employ a team of 5-7 Rangers. To make the best use of resources, the RSPB recommends that Bird Aware Essex re-evaluates the number of rangers currently being considered here given the scale of importance of the Essex coast outlined above.</p>	within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
28	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	The only positive is that within the £9 million you 'may' employ 5 people.	The plan is to provide lasting benefits to habitats of national and international importance in Essex. No amendment proposed.
29	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	Would have been easier to read if the box could have been expanded instead of just the contents. Information useful as a guide or expectation.	Noted.
30	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	£1,000 for signage seems a small budget given the area of coverage and the potential Essex Coastal path. I do not understand the £5,000 cost associated with the visitor numbers and recreational activities. Communication: What about website updates? Is there no cost associated with updating the bye-laws? Contingency seems small.	The RAMS gives more detail regarding the costed mitigation package. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
31	Ms Beverley McClean	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB team	<p>Proposals in the Essex Coast RAMS proposes signage at Mistley Walls. Mistley Walls lie within the proposed extension area to the Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The extension to the Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths AONB is currently awaiting sign off by the Secretary of State. The AONB team are not objecting to the use of new signage in principle but we would like to be involved in discussions on the design of any new signage to be introduced in this area. Any new signage or interpretation boards introduced into the AONB extension area will need to be a high-quality design to reflect the high-quality landscape into which they are to be introduced.</p> <p>As part of the England Coast Path, Natural England is also proposing new signage along the following stretches of the south bank of the Stour: Ray Lane, Ramsey to Stone Point, Wrabness, Stone Point, Wrabness to Hopping Bridge, Mistley. It will be important to co-ordinate the installation of all new signage/ interpretation boards being proposed along the south bank of the Stour to avoid clutter within the extension area to the nationally designated landscape. The AONB team will be happy to provide any further advice on I'm a Good Dog Project if necessary when the RAMS Dog Project is being developed/expanded.</p>	Noted. The Delivery Officer will engage with key local stakeholders on implementation of the project once in post. No amendment proposed.
32	Mr Michael Hand	Campaign to Protect Rural England - Essex Branch	With reference to comments provided in Section 4 above, CPRE questions why the total package budget is not higher and funded through additional revenue from the inclusion of already consented dwellings within the provisions of the SPD.	The RAMS gives more detail regarding the costed mitigation package. There is no mechanism that can lawfully ensure retroactive costs are recouped once full planning permission is granted. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
33	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3





## APPENDIX 3





## APPENDIX 3



## Appendix Two – Essex Coast RAMS Guidelines for proposals for student accommodation

**Table 14 – Appendix 2: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	For supporting and monitoring the effected "Zones" then the LPA's and other LPA's outside of Essex coming into the area could look at providing educational courses in the "Zone" area helping with the volunteers and full-time equivalents (FTEs) could be another way to re-coup some money and also gain some etc. support.	Volunteers may be sought if deemed necessary by the Delivery Officer but no itemised cost has been identified. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	Students and Wildlife - stupid idea.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Frances Coulson	Resident	I disagree. Most student accommodation these days is commercially built and run and charged at vast cost to students or their parents. They should also pay.	Appendix 2 of the SPD outlines that proportionate costs will be applicable to student accommodation in the majority of circumstances. No amendment proposed.
4	Mrs Aileen Cockshott	Resident	Regarding Colchester and Southend, student accommodation should be sited away from the coast.	Noted. The location of new student accommodation is outside the scope of this SPD. No amendment proposed.
5	Mr Terry Newton	Resident	It seems to make sense, but any increase in student impact will need to be monitored, as this can change according to many variables, such as nearby facilities frequented by students.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
6	Mrs Angela Harbottle	Resident	Not qualified to comment.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
7	Mrs Mary Drury	Resident	Not wasting any more time.	Noted. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3





No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
8	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	Not sure I agree with the logic used. The document seems to miss out on how many people of the new dwellings will actually have pets. Dogs being the animal which disturbs the birds. I did not see this taken into consideration.	Many examples of student accommodation do not allow dogs to be kept on the premises, hence the different tariff approach proposed for student accommodation, no amendment proposed.
9	Ms Rachel Cross	Resident	Record number of dogs using space and have rules for dogs and their owners such as those at Essex Wildlife Trust e.g. seen at Langdon nature reserve Dunton.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
10	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	Affordable accommodation and parking needs to be provided.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
11	Mr Matt Eva	Resident	I do not think Student accommodation should be made a special case - if you do this then what about nursing homes or any other housing for private rental where pets are not allowed? Keep it simple, if you're building then you pay.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr Christopher Marten	Resident	Dogs must be kept on leads at all times and ownership of cats should be outlawed because cats can have a devastating effect on bird populations.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
13	Mr Peter Dervin	Resident	Put people first, we need to educate our young people and then maybe they might have a better understanding of the problem instead of taxing them. Every cost in the end is paid for by the end user so it will be our young people that will be put off becoming educated if the costs get too much.	The tariff is paid by the developers of new housing, not residents. It is a one off payment and does not affect investment made by other sources in general education. However, part of the mitigations will be to provide a better understating of the habitats and visitors responsibilities when visiting the coast. No amendment proposed.
14	Mr Neil Hargreaves	Resident	'So, a scheme for 100 student accommodation units would be considered 40 units. 40 units would then be halved providing that future occupiers are prevented from owning a car and keeping a pet: ' This seems overly complex.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			What happens if pets are banned but cars are not? How does anyone know if a student keeps a car off site and says nothing? Will there be a restrictive covenant to stop a future management changing the rules? What about holiday use when conferences are in? The payment would be £24.46. Is it worth all the form filling to collect this? I suggest make a flat rate for student accommodation	within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
15	Mr Brian Jones	Resident	Students often have societies that lead to visits to the coasts, e.g. Birdwatching, geology, botany etc. Such visits may be made by coach and can cause serious disruption to the habitats.	The SPD is related to new residential development only. No amendment proposed.
16	Mrs Joanna Thornicroft	Resident	I can understand a reduced fee per unit as each one would only house a single individual, but there is no reason to believe that students will not visit these areas as much as any other individual.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
17	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	Good points.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
18	Mr Graham Pike	Resident	Nicely explained and detailed.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
19	Councillor Frank Belgrove	Alresford Parish Council	The evidence that dogs are the major threat in causing wild bird flight is interesting.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
20	Mr Roy Hart	Skee-tex Ltd Local Councillor, Head of the River Crouch Conservation trust. Owner of 1.5 miles of river banks of the crouch	Wildlife is thriving.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	This is more taxation by the RAMS and will be difficult to apply.	The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr John Fletcher	Resident	This is a waste of money.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
23	Mrs Jackie Deane	Great Dunmow Town Council	No objections to the proposals.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
24	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	To start building student dwellings in vulnerable areas will raise a few eyebrows. Remembering that all forms of encroachment - light, noise, vibration - can have an impact over varying lengths of time. To encourage a generation to have environmental insight should be seen as proactive. If the correct balance is struck it will be proven in the future.	Locational criteria for development are a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. No amendment proposed.
25	Mr Mark Marshall	Resident	Universities and developers make plenty of money from student accommodation. Why should they be exempt from costs others have to pay? If they do not pay their share, then others pick up the tab and that is not fair.	Appendix 2 of the SPD outlines that proportionate costs will be applicable to student accommodation in the majority of circumstances. The number of student accommodation proposals have not been used to calculate the scale of mitigation needed in the RAMS. Therefore, developers proposing other residential development schemes will not be charged a higher rate to compensate for a lower tariff for student accommodation. No amendment proposed.
26	Mrs Christa-Marie Dobson	Feering & Kelvedon Wildlife Group	A decision is needed for student tariffs.	Appendix 2 of the SPD outlines that proportionate costs will be applicable to student accommodation in the majority of



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				circumstances and sets out methodology. No amendment proposed.
27	Ms Beverley McClean	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB team	The AONB team welcome that a tariff is being considered for proposals for new student accommodation. The approach proposed and the tariff proposed are considered fair and proportionate. Some areas e.g. Colchester have large amounts of both on campus and private student accommodation built or planned within the Zone of Influence of the Colne Estuary. It is therefore appropriate that these developments contribute towards the cost of mitigating the impacts of increased recreational pressure linked to this type of development.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
28	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	The more I see of this format the more irritating it becomes - section by section is unnecessary, off-putting and boring.	Noted. The SPD seeks to be as clear as possible and easy to follow. No amendment proposed.

## Other Comments

**Table 15 – Other Comments: Summary of consultation responses and actions**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
1	Mrs Sharron Amor	Resident	I'm glad that this is being looked into however developing more homes in Essex outside of the coastal areas is also an issue. I live in Billericay and am extremely concerned about the wildlife that would be affected if my LPA goes ahead with its housing plans.	The RAMS and SPD proposes a tariff within a Zone of Influence that extends 22km from coastal areas. No amendment proposed.
2	Magister Debbie Bryce	Landlord	European protected site is of international importance.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
3	Mrs Alwine Jarvis	Resident	This is important work to preserve the environment for birds and for us residents to be part of this. However, as already mentioned this needs to be summarised so more people will be able to actively read everything and get involved as it is so important for our future generations.	Summaries are provided in Sections 2 and 3 of the SPD, which also includes links to a 'Frequently Asked Questions' page on the BirdAware website. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3





No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
4	Mrs Joanna Spencer	Resident	Too much of the countryside is being built on, not enough thought that goes into road structures or new roads being produced, road designs. Residents are never consulted enough or given enough time to object to planning. Southend airport is damaging to peoples' health in the area and the culling of birds to support the airport is not acceptable.	Locational criteria for development, and supporting infrastructure, is a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. The same applies to consultation of planning proposals and Local Plans. No amendment proposed.
5	Mr Matt Eva	Resident	There does not appear to be any consideration of negative impacts of the proposal, e.g. encouraging development elsewhere whilst not reducing impact on sites, and moving problems elsewhere.	Locational criteria for development are a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. No amendment proposed.
6	Mr Bill Sedgwick	Resident	There will be no wildlife or green spaces if the various councils continue to concrete Essex. All that us being built is news type estates that does nothing for the county or environment. There is an abject failure of house builders and councils to look at roads, schools, buses, railway capacity and hospitals.	Locational criteria for development, and supporting infrastructure, is a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. No amendment proposed.
7	Mr Terry Wallace	Resident	Does not view the consultation as important.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
8	Heather Read	Natural England	Support for the determination of the Essex Coast RAMS SPD HRA and SEA Screening.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
9	Mr Richard Carr	Transport for London	Confirmation that we have no comments to make on the draft SPD.	Noted. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
10	Mr Colin Holbrook	Blackmore Village Heritage Association	<p>I support this initiative. When Brentwood Council must consider Bird welfare that is 22 kilometres away from its boundary, it is a shame that more effort is not put into protecting the habitat of people when considering new build habitation. Brentwood Local Development Plan has been adversely impacted and damaged by new development approved by neighbouring Epping Forest District Council.</p> <p>I would urge that all planners are required to afford the same consideration to human neighbours they are legally bound to give to birds.</p>	Locational criteria for development, and supporting infrastructure, is a matter for Local Plans and development management at the LPA level and not within the scope or remit of the RAMS or SPD. No amendment proposed.
11	Ms Margaret Carney	Resident	Unsure what kind of response is required from the consultation and the subject matter.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
12	Mr Edward Harvey	Resident	Is there a document that explains what "Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy" actually means in plain English?	Summaries are provided in Sections 2 and 3 of the SPD, which also includes links to a 'Frequently Asked Questions' page on the BirdAware website. No amendment proposed.
13	Mr Matthew Breeze	County Planning, Minerals & Waste, Cambridgeshire County Council	Confirmation that the County Council, in its role as a Minerals Planning Authority, has no comments on this document.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
14	Mr Stewart Patience	Anglian Water Services Limited	We note that the expectation is that all housing development located within Zones of Influence as defined would be expected to make strategic contributions to the RAMS. Reference is also made to tourism accommodation potentially having significant effects on protected habitats sites and being required to provide a Habitats Assessment and potentially mitigation measures. However, there is no guidance provided for non-housing development which would not be expected to give rise to recreational disturbance. For the avoidance of doubt, we would ask that it made clear that other types of development including infrastructure provided by Anglian Water would not be expected to make contributions to RAMS.	Effects on Habitats Sites from non-residential development proposals, will be addressed in project-level HRAs of proposals, where relevant. It is however proposed that the SPD is amended to refer to set out that all non-residential proposals are exempt from the tariff.
15	Mr John	Resident	It is important to take a detailed look at all adjacent waters to our estuaries as they are a vital link in the chain of protecting wildlife. All rivers feeding estuaries	The scope of the RAMS and SPD is specific to Habitats Site



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Parish		need careful management. Prime example is new vast housing project next to River Blackwater Braintree Essex which is going to be far too close to the river corridor. With increasing population sensible management of coastal areas is even more important. Dogs are a menace on sensitive areas and banning them may be necessary to protect nesting birds. Environment Agency will need to be aware and work with all other agencies etc to achieve improvement for future generations.	designations only. The need for project-level HRAs and where necessary AAs still applies to development proposals, and pathways to Habitats Sites regarding non-recreational effects can be expected to be explored as part of those processes. No amendment proposed.
16	Unknown	CLH Pipeline System Ltd	We would ask that you contact us if any works are in the vicinity of the CLH-PS pipeline or alternatively go to <a href="http://www.lineearchbeforeudig.co.uk">www.lineearchbeforeudig.co.uk</a> , our free online enquiry service.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
17	Ruth & David Burgess	Landowner	As land owners in the Thundersley, Benfleet area, we are interested to learn when the new draft Local Plan is likely to be introduced.	Section 8 of the SPD provides links to all partner LPA websites where updates to Local Plan progress can be found.
18	Mr Frank Last	Badger Rescue	I do not seem to be able to find any mention of Wat Tyler Country Park or Fobbing Marshes in your report. Can I ask why this is? especially due to the large amount of flora & fauna there is at both places.	The scope of the RAMS and SPD is specific to Habitats Site designations only. No amendment proposed.
19	Mr David Dunn	Resident	I feel far more representation on the issue of the effects of the ensuing climate crisis should be at the top of the agenda in all thinking. This along with more heat and new species of birds and marine life a whole new approach has to be adopted to cater for all the habitats they all use alongside our enjoyment of them. Surely to not maintain many of the sea defences is folly, when the already degraded marshes, saltings and cliffs are being wasted and not properly managed mainly due to lack of finances. There have been monies available from the EU in the past for various schemes but have failed to materialise.	The scope of the RAMS and SPD is specific to Habitats Site designations only. No amendment proposed.
20	Mrs Anne Clitheroe	Essex County Council	Essex County Council is satisfied with the content of the Essex Coast RAMS SPD and confirms that it wishes to continue to be engaged in this process	Noted. No amendment proposed.
21	Mr Derek T.	Resident	With so many problems currently confronting the UK, I am very surprised that the subject matter heading, justifies any consideration by Central and Local	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
	Park		Government whatsoever. Furthermore, if pursued, it will incur costly resources, again defrayed by taxation at public expense. The disturbance of coastal bird habitats should be dealt with directly by the Charities or Trusts responsible for such nature reserves. Whoever is responsible for the reserves, could be required to secure boundaries with a single controlled gated access, enabling admission numbers to be limited and a fee charged for entry. Similarly, any erected viewing Hides inside or outside the curtilage of sites, could have a charge machine installed to allow entrance. Any marine entry to reserves should be licensed, authorising where appropriate, limited pre-agreed scheduled frequency of visitation. Otherwise ban with a penalty, such disturbing access. I am fascinated by the composition of the somewhat bureaucratic expansive subject heading.	combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and to deliver the mitigation proposed in the RAMS. Charities and Trusts cannot be expected to generate sources of funding to pay for the mitigation at the scale required. No amendment proposed.
22	Mr John H Bayliss	Hilbery Chaplin	I believe that this is a very important subject to be considered because there is no doubt that the Essex coast and adjoining landscape is of vital importance for the protection of wildlife and the future of this unique part of the United Kingdom.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
23	Mr Mark East	Resident	I have a concern that there could be a legal challenge as no consideration has been given to whether alternative development sites outside of the Zone of Influence are appropriate to reduce the level of development within Zone of Influence areas. Development is being encouraged to boost the Economy without adequate care for the harm to our fragile environment. I feel more time and thought is necessary to find a pragmatic solution and one that delivers protection rather than a source to generate income.	Alternative site allocation outside of the Zone of Influence would only need to be considered in Stage 3 of the HRA process of the LPA's Local Plans. Stage 2 of that process (AA) considers that mitigation is possible to ensure that development proposals would not have any in-combination recreational effects on the Essex Coast's Habitats Sites. As such there was no need for any of the Local Plans to progress to Stage 3 of the HRA process. No amendment proposed.
24	Mrs Linda Findlay	Resident	On any development look at the long-term impact and always ask how can we tweak this to improve our natural environment.	Noted. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3





No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
25	Mr Barrie Ellis	Resident	I hope this level of support goes ahead to protect our coastal areas for birds, whilst taking into account our need for more affordable housing. It is good to see.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
26	Nicola Sirett	Resident	There is no mention of what the money would pay for, beyond a few wardens. Surely there should be some physical infrastructure to manage higher visitor numbers. The report only talks about the impact of visitor numbers. No mention of the pressure on water quality along the coast which comes from managing the increased sewage and storm runoff (due to increased percentage of impermeable surfaces. This is a significant threat to wildlife and local fishing / shell fish (oyster) production. Where can I read the plans to mitigate against these issues?	The RAMS provide more information of the mitigation measures to be funded. The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. The need for project-level HRAs and where necessary AAs still applies to development proposals, and water quality can be expected to be explored as part of those processes. No amendment proposed.
27	Mr Graham Farley	Resident	<p>The plan covers the period to 2038 and yet there is no mention of The National Infrastructure Project at Bradwell in the form of new nuclear power station. Such a build will restrict new housing in particular on Mersea and around Bradwell for evacuation reasons then of course there will be the environmental issues, building issues and restrictions on movement to allow such a build to go ahead.</p> <p>You are costing charges and its admirable to support the numerous environmental protections but if this NIP goes ahead the damage caused to protected areas will completely undermine the East Coast RAMS.</p>	<p>The need for project-level HRAs and where necessary AAs still applies to development proposals, and other non-residential effects can be expected to be explored as part of those processes.</p> <p>The SPD does not apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Plans (NSIPs), which are dealt with under the 2008 Planning Act rather than the Town and country Planning Acts for applications for planning permission. Engagement has not yet gone into sufficient detail however it is expected that the</p>



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				Bradwell B Project would follow the SPD's advice that the 'applicant can provide information for a project level HRA/AA and secure bespoke mitigation to avoid impacts on Habitats sites in perpetuity'. We consider that the nuclear power station, and associated development including the proposed 4,500 temporary workers accommodation would be dealt with via the Development Consent Order. No amendment proposed.
28	Mrs Natasha Hurley	Savills On Behalf of Thames Water Planning Policy	The area affected does not include land served by Thames Water.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
29	Mrs Karen Hawkes	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council	<p>Throughout the SPD there are references to EU Legislation. What will happen after Brexit: will these laws be enshrined in UK Law?</p> <p>Bullet point 4 states "Information on alternative sites for recreation". Whilst it is appreciated that the area needs to be protected the preferred message should be with information signage and alternative routes within the same location. If visitors are being sent to alternative locations this would result in increased motor vehicle usage; visitors may be less likely to visit the site which would affect their health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Bullet point 6 "Interpretation and signage" - Members would welcome universal / uniform signage throughout all the Essex Coastal Habitats.</p> <p>Page 12 Action Area Table - Members would request that relevant Town and Parish Council are detailed as partnership organisation.</p> <p>P13 Budget and Appendix 1 Strategic Mitigation - Whilst members are</p>	<p>The content of the relevant EU Directives related to birds and habitats have been transposed into UK law and will continue to apply. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The message regarding 'alternative sites for recreation' can be expected to apply to future trips for recreation.</p> <p>Noted. Comments regarding uniform signage and additional stakeholders in the partnership organisation can be acted upon by the Delivery Officer, once</p>



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>supportive of the Action Areas identified, there are concerns as to whether they are deliverable within the budget identified. Members suggest that the toolkit needs revisiting to ensure that the projects can be delivered within the budget available. They also identified that there is excessive funding on personnel and enforcement and insufficient funding on the delivery of actual projects. Members are also concerned that the type of projects proposed are already being delivered by other stakeholders and that this is an unnecessary duplication of work.</p> <p>P15 Schemes under 10 dwellings - There are concerns that reasonable costs of completing and checking the agreement is not required and that a more straight forward method would be as a matter of course to charge the £122 a home once the location is identified within a zone as detailed on p7.</p> <p>P16.5 Alternative to paying into RAMS - Point 5 should be removed. There should be no option for developers to carry out their own surveys. If the surveyor evidenced that there was no requirement to fund the tariff this would result in a shortfall in the anticipated income and as a result projects detailed may not be able to be funded.</p> <p>P17 6.3 Steering Group - This should include relevant partners as detailed in table 4.1.</p> <p>With reference to the steering group, members would welcome a representative from all partnership organisations as detailed on P13 with the addition of Town and Parish Councils. As currently stipulated in the plan there is no input from RSPB, Essex Wildlife Trust and Town and Parish Councils.</p>	<p>appointed. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Some LPA partners do not charge a legal fee for minor applications, they are solely required to pay the tariff. Schemes under 10 dwellings have been identified as requiring to pay for legal costs as no mechanism currently exists for smaller proposals to pay through a Section 106 agreement. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Alternatives to paying developer contributions to the RAMS would only be acceptable where bespoke mitigation addressing recreational effects on the Essex Coast can be delivered. To identify and justify other forms of mitigation as suitable, visitor surveys would have to be produced by the applicant.</p>
30	Mrs Susie Jenkins	Brightlingsea Nature Network	<p>This strategy encourages LPAs to grant planning permission as a way to accrue money for this fund. How will this be avoided? Also, there is no mention throughout this strategy that some habitats should not be developed near due to disturbance. LPAs should feel supported in turning down inappropriate development.</p>	<p>The tariff is proportionate to the in-combination effect each new dwelling will have on the Essex Coast's Habitats Sites and monies collected will not be used</p>



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				<p>to fund anything other than the strategic mitigation of the RAMS. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Each development proposal within the Zone of Influence will need to undertake an HRA and where appropriate an AA to assess other non-recreational effects on Habitats Sites. This will include development near to the Habitats Sites themselves. No amendment proposed.</p>
31	Mr PC Paul Rawson 2858	Essex Police Marine Unit	As part of Essex Police Marine unit, we would be very grateful to discuss potential outcomes for the future and any possibility of joint working.	Noted. Joint working requests can be acted upon by the Delivery Officer, once appointed. No amendment proposed.
32	Mr Edward Harvey	Resident	Is there a document that explains what "Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy" actually means in plain English?	Sections 2 and 3 of the SPD provide summaries of the RAMS and scope of the SPD. Additionally, the SPD signposts a 'frequently asked questions' (FAQ) document' which is available on the Bird Aware Essex Coast website. No amendment proposed.
33	Mrs Diane McCarthy	Billericay Town Council	The document makes no mention of any sustainable methods of transport.	Each partner LPA's Local Plan contains policies regarding sustainable transport. No amendment required.
34	Ms Diane Jackson	MAG London Stansted Airport	We have no aerodrome safeguarding objections to the proposals.	Noted. No amendment required.



## APPENDIX 3





No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
35	Councillor Roy Martin	Resident	The consultation has been badly designed, extremely lengthy and not user friendly, so it is not practical for everyone to respond in full. The main area of major concern in Hockley and the District of Rochford is the volume of massive new builds being allowed which impacts on every aspect of life including transport systems. Developers should be held responsible for the impact on infrastructure and protection of the environment with penalties applied for failure to comply. Local knowledge and views must be satisfactorily resolved to give the government a better understanding of the consequences of their decisions before planning is approved.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. No amendment proposed.
36	Mr Graham Pike	Resident	I found this a very interesting exercise. The documentation was laid out well. Lots of useful data included. Findings very sound.	Noted. No amendment required.
37	Mrs Helen Waterfield	Black Notley Parish Council	<p>Black Notley Parish Council support the strategy. We generally agree on the Action/Examples given however we strongly feel that there should be no newbuilds at all in close proximity to sensitive sites. Development of recreational facilities must not impact on the character and charm of the very areas this is setting out to protect. Footpaths/Access and Parking Facilities must only be developed in keeping with the existing location and area.</p> <p>In the more outlying locations diverting Footpaths away from the waterside areas and installing screening is also unfair to ramblers and wildlife watchers who want to appreciate the Estuary views.</p> <p>We look forward to more and better access to Footpaths along this special coastline and Footpath Maps should be provided. There should be separate routes for cyclists.</p> <p>Access to Sites of Special Interest should be limited only during the breeding season of birds and wildlife, and dogs must be kept on a lead at these times.</p>	<p>Each development proposal within the Zone of Influence will need to undertake an HRA and where appropriate an AA to assess other non-recreational effects on Habitats Sites. This will include development near to the Habitats Sites themselves. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The Essex Coast RAMS toolkit (Table 4.1 of the SPD) includes 'Provision of information and education' as an Action Area. This could include 'maps with circular routes away from the coast on alternative footpaths.' No amendment required.</p>
38	Mr Vincent Titchmarsh	Titchmarsh Marina (Walton-on-the-Naze) Ltd	This scheme is totally undemocratic and dictatorial - it is obvious that this consultation document is circulated purely in order to comply with necessary regulations.	Noted. High-level oversight of the project is undertaken by the Essex Coastal Forum which



## APPENDIX 3



No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			RAMS is an unmanageable, unnecessary proposed organisation, to be run by un-elected, un-regulated members with the power to raise money, at the expense of the housing market; mostly affecting the less well off in society who need affordable council or private sector housing.	included locally elected Members. No amendment proposed.
39	Mrs Jacqueline Smith	Resident	<p>I generally agree on the Action/Examples given, however strongly feel that there should be no newbuilds at all in close proximity to sensitive sites. Development of recreational facilities must not impact on the character and charm of the very areas this is setting out to protect. Footpaths/Access and Parking Facilities must only be developed in keeping with the existing location and area.</p> <p>In the more outlying locations diverting Footpaths away from the waterside areas and installing screening is also unfair to ramblers and wildlife watchers who want to appreciate the Estuary views.</p> <p>I look forward to more and better access to Footpaths along this special coastline and Footpath Maps should be provided. There should be separate routes for cyclists.</p> <p>Access to Sites of Special Interest should be limited only during the breeding season of birds and wildlife, and dogs must be kept on a lead at these times.</p>	<p>Each development proposal within the Zone of Influence will need to undertake an HRA and where appropriate an AA to assess other non-recreational effects on Habitats Sites. This will include development near to the Habitats Sites themselves. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The Essex Coast RAMS toolkit (Table 4.1 of the SPD) includes 'Provision of information and education' as an Action Area. This could include 'maps with circular routes away from the coast on alternative footpaths.' No amendment required.</p>
40	Mr Mark Nowers	RSPB	Regarding the 'Essex Coast RAMS SPD SEA/HRA Screening Report' - Further to our comments regarding the Outer Thames SPA, we note that in Appendix 2 (Broad illustration of the Zone of Influence of the RAMS) that red line extends over the Outer Thames SPA designation, but it is not identified as such.	It is proposed that the map in Appendix 2 of the Essex Coast RAMS SPD SEA/HRA Screening Report be amended.
41	Mrs Jackie Deane	Great Dunmow Town Council	The Town Council is generally supportive of the proposals.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
42	Mr Gavin Rowsell	Resident	I think I have put my point across.	Noted. No amendment proposed.



## APPENDIX 3



### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
43	Mrs Angela Faulds	Brentwood and Chelmsford Green Party	We feel the area is already overdeveloped and the expectation of nearly a quarter of a million more people living alongside the coastal areas of Essex, with their priceless wildlife habitats, is unsustainable.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
44	Mr Julian Novorol	Hamford Water Management Committee	We would like to request that when rangers are appointed for the coast/ Hamford Water area – that we have the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the management/ problems that we experience in the Backwaters.	The Delivery Officer and Rangers can explore joint working arrangements, once appointed. No amendment required.
45	Mrs Jane Taylor	North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>On behalf of the Health system in North East Essex namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group</li> <li>- East Suffolk North Essex Foundation Trust</li> <li>- Anglian Community Enterprise</li> <li>- Essex Partnership University Trust</li> <li>- East of England Ambulance Service</li> </ul> <p>We have reviewed the above and acknowledge the content, we have no formal feedback to provide.</p>	Noted. No amendment proposed.
46	Mrs Kelly Holland	Canewdon Parish Council	Canewdon Parish Council support the aims of the document particularly the requirement that all developments would have to take the document into account especially those that do not go through the formal planning process.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
47	Mr K. Randall	Resident	<p>I feel the most important matter to consider in this Planning Document is the predicted rise in water levels caused by climate change. Another concern is coastal erosion which is extremely difficult to contain and resolve. As for developments, the Authorities should consider arranging for proposals to be based further inland and, if possible, on higher ground due to the threat of rising water levels. Also, the Authorities should mitigate the over development and, instead, concentrate on improving the environment, services and infrastructure in these coastal areas. No development should be allowed in on Green Belt Land. Due consideration should be given to building new housing in a manner that negates the effects of climate change in the future. Perhaps the Local Authorities could request that some trees are planted on new housing development estates.</p> <p>I feel that the priority of all the Local Authorities involved is to protect our</p>	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Decisions on the distribution of new housing growth is outside the scope of this SPD. No amendment proposed.



6



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			valued coastline areas from flooding and that any new housing proposals should be curtailed until this protection has been put in place.	
48	Mr Bernard Foster	Resident	If you want to sell what can only be seen by the general public as restrictions, you need to show that you support realistic alternatives away from the sensitive areas. Interact with local infant and junior schools in a positive way, children remember best what they enjoy, so make it fun to learn.	Each development proposal within the Zone of Influence will need to undertake an HRA and where appropriate an AA to assess other non-recreational effects on Habitats Sites. This will include development near to the Habitats Sites themselves. Engagement with local schools will be considered by the Delivery Officer once in post. No amendment proposed.
49	Mr Tim Woodward	The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	We are very concerned that members, who may be considering a development on their land which will help local authorities meet their housing targets, or a visitor facility or commercial development which will help to boost tourism to the area or provide rural employment, could face CIL charges as well as the charges proposed in the SPD. It seems unfair that they will be held responsible for increased recreational access to the Essex coast, and consequent disturbance to habitats and bird species, at a time when extra access is being actively encouraged and facilitated by the delivery of the England Coast Path by Natural England.	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only and enables housing growth to continue in line with the requirements of the Birds Directive and Habitats Directive. No amendment proposed.
50	Parish Clerk for West Horndon Parish Council Kim Harding	West Horndon Parish Council	West Horndon Parish Council supports the broad principles of the RAMS.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
51	Ms Jo Steranka	Resident	The Essex coastline, and therefore the Designated Sites are low-lying. The highest land point is at Walton-on-Naze, which is a mere 20 metres above sea level. This means that they are highly vulnerable to erosion and sea-level rise. The only mitigation for climate-induced habitat loss in the future is to minimise	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only.





### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>the carbon emissions from residential dwellings.</p> <p>Whilst not specifically commenting on the section on student residential development, I note that it is considered that the Tariff for these developments should be reduced because students are not generally car or dog owners.</p> <p>The Strategy has missed an opportunity to use the residential planning process to control the availability of parking in new developments and household energy efficiency (for example) to mitigate against damage to the Designated Sites from climate heating. It might be argued that 73,000 new homes is a fraction of the carbon emissions threatening the planet, but on an annual basis those emissions will still make a contribution.</p>	<p>The type of new dwellings built within the Zones of Influence and parking standards for new dwellings is outside the scope of the SPD.</p> <p>Each development proposal within the Zone of Influence will need to undertake an HRA and where appropriate an AA to assess other non-recreational effects on Habitats Sites. This will include development near to the Habitats Sites themselves. No amendment proposed.</p>
52	Ms Beverley McClean	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB team	Please see the map for the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB extension area which may be useful for future discussions.	Noted. No amendment required.
53	Mrs Cecilia Dickinson	Resident	<p>The LPAs, ECC and Natural England want to charge property developers per unit to mitigate potential disturbance to bird/coastal habitat, yet Natural England want to build a coastal path – an invitation to people to trek the coastal path causing the disturbance that mitigation is being planned for.</p> <p>One or the other. Either protect the coastal sites - or build a coastal path and the wildlife can take its chances. The Habitats Regulations already require these sites to be protected. Use the collections to fund on-the-ground mitigation as well as digital media that should be being provided by the LPAs and Essex anyway. Nobody asked us if we want all these residential units built - we are told we are going to get thousands. Do not build on greenfield sites, do not build near the coast, designate some sites as people sites. Natural England will have to reroute the path.</p>	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. Natural England have been involved in the development of the RAMS and SPD. The distribution of new housing growth is outside the scope of this SPD. No amendment required.
54	Ms Jessica Ferguson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	The Regulations require an assessment of whether a project i.e. a development proposal, is likely to have a significant effect either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects. Planning permission should not be	Under the Habitats Regulations each development proposal will need a project-level HRA. This is



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>granted for such unless appropriate mitigation is provided. It would seem appropriate, since development has to be assessed based upon the likelihood of significant effects arising from the development alone and relevant mitigation provided, that the same approach is also taken to assess 'in combination' effects. Relevant and necessary mitigation should only be provided, based upon the scale of the proposal, its use and the site context, rather than this being prescribed for every development. The SPD however takes a more generalised approach, requiring the same contribution from every development regardless of its context or specific use.</p> <p>Requiring a site-specific assessment takes a similar approach to that by an Inspector into a recent appeal in Chelmsford (Appeal Reference APP/W1525/W/19/3236158). He stated that he could "not be satisfied that the suggested mitigation measures within the planning obligation would be sufficient to mitigate the harm to the Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar site and the Essex Estuaries SAC" (paragraph 19). This is suggestive that an approach to determining whether there is likely to be a significant effect should be determined on a case by case basis. This then raises a question as to whether Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations is met, particularly in terms of whether such a contribution could be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Whilst the SPD seeks to justify the contribution against Regulation 122 at paragraph 4.12, this is tenuously linked.</p> <p>The SPD does not take into account other mitigation proposed or in place on site or in the vicinity of the site, which is aimed at ensuring that residents do not travel to Habitats sites. Whilst it is acknowledged that paragraph 5.2 of the SPD identifies that an alternative to such a contribution would be for applicants to conduct their own visitor surveys and secure bespoke mitigation, this is not particularly advocated by the SPD and does not specify other considerations that would have a bearing on the mitigation that might be required e.g. on site spaces and local facilities etc.</p> <p>The generalised approach taken also has implications for the applications to</p>	<p>still the case for proposals within the Zone of Influence, and any resultant AA will set out recommendations to mitigate effects that are directly related to the proposal. This will include other mitigation proposed or in place on site or in the vicinity of the site, which is aimed at ensuring that residents do not travel to Habitats sites. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The tariff is evidence based and proportionate. It is considered inappropriate to apply a 'sliding-scale' in regard to the tariff at this stage and a 'blanket tariff' is proposed as the RAMS seeks to mitigate 'in-combination' effects i.e. those identified from accumulated housing growth in the Zol. This can however be reviewed annually by the Delivery Officer once appointed. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The appeal referred to was dismissed in January 2020. The Inspector states at paragraph 19 that a copy of the completed obligation towards mitigation measures at Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar site and the</p>



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>which the SPD applies which at paragraph 3.8 is identified to include residential care homes, boarding schools, military barracks along with HMO's. Realistically the recreational impacts of each of these will be significantly different from say a family home. However, the approach taken in the SPD is the same for all residential development listed. It is acknowledged that the RAMS tariff of £122.33 would not be a 'fair and proportionate contribution' as it is recognised that any recreational disturbance will not be dog related. The SPD also recognises that in Chelmsford, purpose-built student accommodation, given its distance from Habitats sites and the restrictions generally preventing students from owning a car or a pet, would mean that such developments will not lead to likely significant effects on Habitats sites from increased recreational disturbance. Thus, if it is recognised that a standard approach is not appropriate in some situations, it should equally be applied to others where there will be differing recreational impacts.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.10 of the SPD acknowledges that reserved matters applications will be considered on an individual basis having regard to whether the potential effects of the proposal were fully considered when the existing outline was granted. However, when developing Local Plans and when considering any new applications that come forward, these should have already taken into account any outline applications that had been determined at that time. Such proposals then risk double consideration and the requirement for a contribution towards 'in-combination' effects has the risk of being unrelated to the impacts of the development on the basis that it's 'in-combination' effects would already have been considered by other developments. Therefore, in such situations, when considering the application at the reserved matters stage it should instead be looking at the effects of the development alone.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that the requested contribution is to go towards funding measures set out in Table 4.1. Some measures may not however be relevant to all development proposals and others could be directly provided by the applicant themselves i.e. provision information and education. This again indicates that a more tailored approach to each application is required. Having reviewed the mitigation package as costed at Appendix 1 we similarly note</p>	<p>Essex Estuaries SAC was not provided so the Inspector could not be satisfied that the suggested mitigation measures would be sufficient. The principle of the RAMS was not addressed further by the Inspector in the report.</p> <p>The RAMS and SPD applies only to 'in-combination effects' which have been identified within the HRAs of the LPAs' Local Plans. Each Local Plan's resultant AA and consultation with Natural England, has identified the need for the RAMS to mitigate in-combination effects and enable development.</p> <p>An amendment to the SPD setting out the requirements of development proposals in regard to statutory HRA procedures and on-site mitigation, and the specific effects the RAMS will mitigate in accordance with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations, is proposed.</p> <p>An amendment justifying the inclusion of C2 Residential Institutions and C2A Secure Residential Institutions as</p>



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>items included which would not be relevant to every development, for instance, not every new residential unit will be for a household with a dog or one which undertakes water sports.</p> <p>There is also a concern with respect of the way in which the figure has been calculated. Whilst it is appreciated that the mitigation package cost has been identified as set out at Appendix 1, the division of this total cost by the total number of dwellings which are currently identified to be built over Local Plan Periods until 2038 does not necessary accurately reflect the number which will come forward in the next 18 years. It is likely that, given the Government’s emphasis on building new homes, in response to consistent demographic change, that this number will increase. Consequently, this would mean that the contributions collected would exceed the overall cost for the mitigation package. It thus needs to be ensured that, should such an approach to mitigation be adopted (notwithstanding the concerns highlighted above), there are adequate reviews and adjustments to the unit charge accordingly to ensure such figures are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Thus, we endorse, without prejudice to our view that the approach is of itself too generalised, the suggestion at paragraph 6.4 that the monitoring process be “fit for purpose”.</p>	<p>qualifying within the scope of tariff payments is proposed.</p> <p>Regarding reserved matters applications, the quantum of development has been considered in regard to quantifying effects of Local Plan growth, where identified within those Plans. This justifies the tariff being applicable to reserved matters applications, however separate consideration should be given due to the findings of their project-level HRA/AAs where they may have been published prior to the emergence of the RAMS. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Development proposals within the Zone of Influence will still need to undertake project-level HRA/AA. Proposals may also include bespoke mitigation, and the SPD includes details on this within Sections 5 and 3.14. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed. Adequate reviews and adjustments to the</p>





**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				tariff are included within the SPD. No amendment proposed.
55	Mrs Charlotte Bailey	Resident	<p>Natural England is a partner in RAMS, which is hypocritical as they will inflict the England Coast Path on to the River. More publicity means more people walking in the fragile countryside and disturbing birds. Notices warning dog owners to keep dogs on leads are currently ignored and notices are removed from fences.</p> <p>Attempts to try to 'educate the public' will not work and the RAMS will not be able to avoid disturbing birds. Essex has been destroyed with over development. Perhaps included in Information Packs for new home owners a guide could be enclosed to try and educate people on how to behave in the countryside, and how to behave amongst birds &amp; animals.</p>	The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. The mitigation proposed within the RAMS does not seek to prevent visitors to the Essex coast, rather its focus is on raising awareness of issues at the coast and to foster positive behaviours. No amendment proposed.
56	Mrs Jane Black	The Wivenhoe Society	<p>The calculated tariff does not appear to make any allowance for the need to set aside funding to cover costs in perpetuity but is set at a rate which just covers costs over the period 2019 to 2038 (plus 10% contingency)</p> <p>The proposed tariff is set at the same level regardless of dwelling size. The potential for recreational disturbance will depend on the increase in population so it would be fairer to relate the contribution to dwelling size.</p> <p>In table 3.2 the use class C2 is included. In Appendix 2 there is discussion of how student accommodation should be treated but there is no similar discussion for care homes. Care Homes for the elderly are unlikely to generate much recreational disturbance, particularly water based. Consideration should be given to this use class and how an appropriate tariff, if any, should be calculated.</p> <p>Holiday caravan/chalet developments are not included in the list of use classes. Nor is other tourist accommodation. This is discussed in paragraph 3.10 but it is not made clear whether a financial contribution to the scheme will be required.</p>	<p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The per dwellings tariff is evidence based and proportionate to the 'in-combination' effects identified i.e. those identified from accumulated housing growth in the Zol. Each individual proposal is still required to address the specific effects on Habitats Sites through project-level HRA/AA within the Zone of Influence, including recreational effects. At this stage effects resulting from dwelling size be addressed and mitigation recommended where necessary. This can however be reviewed annually by the Delivery</p>



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				<p>Officer once appointed. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Adequate reviews and adjustments to the tariff are included within the SPD. As explained in the RAMS Strategy Document, an in-perpetuity fund will be developed to ensure that mitigation will be delivered in-perpetuity. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>An amendment justifying the inclusion of C2 Residential Institutions and C2A Secure Residential Institutions as qualifying within the scope of tariff payments is proposed.</p> <p>Section 3.9 of the SPD states that, 'Other types of development, for instance tourist accommodation, may be likely to have significant effects on protected habitat sites related to recreational pressure and will in such cases need to be subject of an Appropriate Assessment as part of the Habitats Regulations. As part of this assessment any mitigation proposals (including those which address any recreational pressure) will need to</p>



### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				be considered separately from this strategy and taken into account by the appropriate authorities.' No amendment proposed.
57	Mrs Heather Archer	Highways England	Having examined the consultation documents, we are satisfied that its policies will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN. Highways England does not offer any comments on the consultation at this time.	Noted. No amendment required.
58	Mr Phill Bamford	Gladman	<p>We welcome the proactive and strategic approach that the 12 authorities have taken to addressing this issue and we support the tariff approach to developer contributions which will hopefully simplify the S106 process and ensure a fair and transparent process. However, in introducing the tariff approach, it is essential that all authorities test the level of contribution, alongside all their policy requirements contained in their Local Plans to ensure that the contributions are viable. The level of contribution has been tested through some of the Essex Authorities Local Plan Viability Assessments, but to ensure that the level of contribution is acceptable and will not affect the overall viability of sites, it must be tested through all of the emerging Local Plans for the remaining affected authorities. Should it be found through this process that the level of contribution would cause any of the Essex authorities viability issues, then amendments need to be made to either the specific Local Plan policy in the relevant Local Plan or to the Essex Coast RAMS SPD, to review the level of contributions so that sites remain viable.</p> <p>This issue also applies to the comment made in Paragraph 4.4 of the Draft SPD which states that the tariff will be reviewed periodically and republished as necessary. If the tariff is to be amended, then the proposed revised tariff cost must be below the top of the range of figures tested through the viability assessments of the various Essex authorities Local Plans. If it is proposed that the tariff would increase above the range of costs tested in those viability assessments, then this would trigger a review of the Local Plans affected.</p>	Planning Policy Officers from each of the 12 LPAs have been involved in the progression of the RAMS and SPD since its inception and are thus aware of the tariff introduced. The subject of viability in regard to the tariff can be explored within Local Plan examinations, where deemed relevant. No amendment proposed.



### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
59	Mr Michael Atkins	The Port of London Authority (PLA)	<p>It is noted that table 4.1. (The Essex coast and RAMS toolkit) identifies several mitigation measures. Of these mitigation measures the 'provision of information and education' action area includes a requirement to provide information on the sensitive wildlife and habitats. Although we would encourage education to improve awareness, it must be done in such a way as to not encourage people to visit to see the features of designation such as the populations of overwintering birds.</p> <p>Also, within table 4.1, under the 'habitat creation' and 'monitoring' action areas; to note any habitat creation schemes and/or surveys taken place on the River Thames may require a River Works License with the PLA. The PLA requests to be contacted at an early stage with regard to any habitat restoration proposals within the PLA's jurisdiction. The PLA should also be included under the list of potential partners under the 'partnership working' action area.</p> <p>Within appendix 1 (Strategic Mitigation) it is noted that the mitigation packages for habitat creation and ground nesting bird projects are not proposed to start until year five of the timeline. The PLA considers that these types of projects should be identified at an earlier stage to ensure opportunities for such projects are not lost before any assessments take place.</p> <p>With regard to monitoring of the SPD, it is noted that an annual report will be provided to each LPA to inform individual Authority Monitoring Reports (AMR). The PLA requests to also receive the annual report to be kept update on the progress on the actions contained in the SPD.</p>	The suggested actions are considered relevant for exploration by the Delivery Officer, once appointed. No amendment proposed.
60	Ms Alexa Burns	Emery Planning on behalf of the Williams Group	A blanket tariff does not seem to be a fair approach given that some locations within the Zone of Influence are up to 22 kilometres away from the relevant estuary and only within one Zone of Influence, whereas other locations are within a few kilometres of one or more estuaries and within the Zone of Influence of 5 estuaries. It is considered that a zoned tariff, based upon the number of Zones of Influence a site is within and the distance it is away from the Zone of Influence should be applied. Sites with a greater likely impact on the Zones of Influence will therefore pay a greater tariff and sites on the periphery of the Zones of Influence will pay less.	The RAMS sets out how the Zone of Influence was calculated, including using visitor surveys. Questions asked of visitors to the SPA locations were designed to collect data on the reasons for visits as well as postcodes to evidence Zones of Influence. Additional surveys will improve





**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>In addition, the 72,907 dwellings upon which the tariff figure is calculated appears to be an uncertain basis upon which to base the tariff. The reference to the fact that this figure is not definitive and will be subject to review requires clarification. When and how will these reviews take place and how will they be reflected within the SPD?</p>	<p>the robustness of the datasets and repeat surveys of visitors will be undertaken at the earliest opportunity to review the postcode data and Zone of Influence. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The tariff is evidence based and proportionate to the 'in-combination' effects identified i.e. those identified from accumulated housing growth in the Zol. Each individual proposal is still required to address the specific effects on Habitats Sites through project-level HRA/AA within the Zone of Influence, including recreational effects. At this stage, effects resulting from a proposal's proximity to the Habitats Sites can be addressed and mitigation recommended where necessary. This can however be reviewed annually by the Delivery Officer once appointed. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. Adequate reviews and adjustments to the tariff are included within the SPD and will</p>



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				be undertaken annually in line with each LPA's requirement to publish an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). No amendment proposed.
61	Heather Read	Natural England	<p>Essex Coast RAMS Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - As mentioned, we understand that the aim of the SPD is to set out the procedures to facilitate the collection of financial contributions towards the identified mitigation measures. On this basis Natural England does not wish to offer substantive comments on SPD and the mechanisms outlined and generally supports its aims.</p> <p>Nevertheless, we would highlight the need for the SPD (and accompanying assessments) to accurately approach the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, such as the hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation and compensation, but also the terminology in terms of impacts. For example, paragraph 2.14 of the SPD refers to the delivery of mitigation to avoid likely significant effects, however the intention of Essex Coast RAMS mitigation is to enable the conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the international designated sites and we would advise clarification on this point. Natural England would also draw your attention to our previous advice on the provision of avoidance measures, such as well-designed open space/green infrastructure, within development boundaries for larger scale schemes (as per our letter reference 244199). We would continue to promote this approach and would suggest this is reflected within the framework of the SPD.</p> <p>Finally, we note the intentions of Appendix 2 which refers to the proportionate assessment for student accommodation. Whilst Natural England does not wish to comment specifically on this approach, we would emphasise the need for consistency with the housing figures used to calculate the tariff to ensure that there is no shortfall in overall funds of the mitigation package, which is otherwise the responsibility of the Competent Authority.</p> <p>Essex Coast RAMS SPD Habitats Regulations Assessment and Strategic</p>	<p>Amendments are proposed that reiterate the requirement for project-level HRA/AA of development proposals which will explore the hierarchy of avoidance and mitigation, and that the SPD is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects only.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed to the SPD and the Essex Coast RAMS SPD SEA/HRA Screening Report to clearly set out that the intention of Essex Coast RAMS mitigation to enable the conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the international designated sites.</p>



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			Environmental Assessment Screening - In summary Natural England notes the undertaken assessment and we are generally satisfied with the conclusions of the SEA and HRA Screening report (August 2019), in that the SPD can be screened out for its requirement of Strategic Environmental Assessment and the conclusion of the Habitats Regulation Screening that no further assessment is necessary at this time. As above, we would emphasise the recognition of the aims of the Essex Coast RAMS mitigation in ensuring no adverse effect on integrity, rather than avoiding likely significant effects.	
62	Mr Mark De Roy	Landowner	<p>Because of 'Natural England's' 'Coastal Path scheme (my land is 5 miles from the 'Coast') I now have to fence and subdivide my land to protect a multiple of commercial interests and personal garden and amenity areas. I have been told some simple signage may be made available? I will witness a massive increase in the disturbance by 'walkers', 'visitors' to important designated sites of wildlife protection and previously privately protected 'Semi Natural Ancient Woodland' with protected wildlife habitats.</p> <p>A new 'Tax/Charge' on new dwellings is doubling up on an existing 'Community Infrastructure Levy' further dissuading philanthropic land owners to undertake the provision of village low cost housing provision to help the locally born working in the countryside to live in it. If this is to go ahead, I would only support it if the fund is administered by my 'Local Authority' who have to answer to the residents of this area as to how that money is accounted for and used. I would not support this levy if unaccountable 'Agencies' and dubious 'Charities' are handed yet more landowners money to be mis-spent and wasted yet again.</p>	<p>The scope of the SPD, and the tariff proposed, is relevant to 'in-combination' recreational effects from future housing growth only. No amendment required. The Essex Coastal Path is outside the scope of the SPD.</p> <p>The tariff will be collected and administered at the LPA level and development applications will continue to be determined by the LPA also. No amendment required.</p>
63	Mr Gary Guiver	Tendring DC on behalf of various key stakeholders with an interest in this project	<p>I am writing on behalf of Tendring District Council in response to the consultation exercise for the Essex Coast Recreation Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to express some of the comments, issues and concerns raised to me by various key stakeholders with an interest in this project.</p> <p>Fundamental concerns have been expressed locally about any strategy or intervention that curtails or restricts the potential for residents and visitors to access and enjoy the coast and which would therefore diminish Tendring's</p>	In ensuring that residential development can be permitted without the determination that there would be resultant significant effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites due to recreational disturbance, the tariff can enable growth in Tendring. Many development proposals



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>potential for tourism, economic growth and a healthy resident population.</p> <p>Examples of the more specific concerns and suggestions raised by local stakeholders with unquestionable knowledge of their area (particularly Hamford Water) are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the money raised through RAMS contributions should not dissuade philanthropic land owners wishing to release land for the provision of low-cost housing for people born locally to live and work in the countryside.</li> <li>• That the RAMS contributions secured from developments in the Tendring area should be controlled and administered only by Tendring District Council as the local authority directly answerable to the landowners, businesses and residents affected. They should not be handed to a potentially unaccountable and faceless body.</li> <li>• The area termed Hamford Water is not, as the documentation suggests, a natural habitat. Instead it is a largely man-made environment that requires constant maintenance, dredging and management to avoid siltation caused by the grass and seaweeds growing in the water, which would otherwise rapidly turn into dried out marsh – as can already be witnessed at Hamford Water.</li> <li>• Whilst the emphasis of the documentation seems to major on birds, the whole chain of natural life requires far closer investigation – e.g. shellfish in Hamford Water (which have been poisoned by human e-coli through the release of sewage from Kirby and Bath House Meadows pumping stations); and sea mammals including seals and porpoises.</li> <li>• There are significant and important other Statutory Bodies with strong legal and commercial interests in Hamford Water including the Harwich Harbour Authority (who has control over the navigation and who collect Port Dues for shipping movements to Bramble Island); and Crown Estates, who own most of Hamford Water below the low tide level.</li> </ul>	<p>related to tourism, economic growth and health are exempt from the tariff.</p> <p>Tendring District Council, as one of the partner LPAs, will be accountable for the collection of the tariff and implementation of the mitigation measures in the Tendring District Council area. Section 6.3 of the SPD states that, 'A representative from each of the partner LPAs, together forming 'The RAMS Steering Group', shall work with the Essex Coast RAMS team...'</p> <p>The RAMS and SPD are related only to the effects of recreational disturbance on those wildlife designations that are classified as 'Habitats Sites' of which some of the most significant are within Tendring District, such as Hamford Water and the Stour Estuary. At the Essex Coast these are predominantly designated due to birds. Other effects from development proposals would be explored at the development management stage, in line with requirements for project-level HRA/AA, ecology assessments and Environmental Impact</p>





## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hamford Water has been able to manage itself and the wildlife present to a very high standard, without the need for draconian legal powers and without constant surveillance. The Hamford Water management Committee already supervises the area at nil cost to anyone except the organisations that willingly contribute – however this body nor any of its members are mentioned once in the RAMS documentation.</li> <li>• The level and nature of monitoring being proposed in the documentation are likely to have little worth, if it is anything like the level of evidence in the report. For example, it is said that the launching of Jet-Skis will be prohibited by legislation at Titchmarsh Marina and in the area around Mill Lane in Walton – yet there is no Jet-Ski activity in Hamford Water and launching is already not permitted at Titchmarsh Marina, Walton &amp; Frinton Yacht Club or at the Walton Town Hard. Jet-Skis do launch from Dovercourt Bay.</li> <li>• Additionally proscribing Jet-Skis totally is contrary to the United Nations Charter of the Seas and Freedom of Navigation to which the UK is a signatory; applying to all coastal areas that do not dry out at low-tide.</li> <li>• It is suggested that people walking on the salt-marsh in the south-eastern corner of Hamford Water is causing significant damage, but without any evidence or detail of the alleged activity. In the last 55 years, little if any such activity has occurred and the only places of access in the south eastern area where the foreshore is accessible are at Island Lane and Foundry Creek where one would sink into soft mud if any such activity was tried.</li> <li>• The documentation states that the Naze are part of the Nature Reserve where wildlife is being affected by people walking there with dogs off their leads – but this area is owned by Tendring District Council having been sold to its successor (the Frinton and Walton Urban District Council) by Essex County Council on the condition it remained a public area with unrestricted public access in perpetuity. There is little wildlife to be found on the Naze other than</li> </ul>	<p>Assessments (EIA) where relevant and required of proposals at the LPA level.</p> <p>The Essex RAMS toolkit includes, within the ‘education and communication’ Action Area, direct engagement with clubs and relevant organisation. The implementation of this can begin once the Delivery Officer is appointed. The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Moreover, all measures will be actioned meaning that contributions will fund this project. Because contributions are from within the zones of influence, there is no prospect of funding being diverted away from areas that require the greatest protection.</p>



### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>Muntjac, a few rabbits and various gulls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imposing restrictions on the lawful peaceful use of the area around Hamford Water is unwarranted and could prove to be counterproductive. Bird surveys conducted by the local Warden show consistent healthy increases in the bird population.</li> <li>• It should be questioned why the Environment Agency licence to the blowing of eggs of the Lesser Black Backed Gull on Hedge End Island – as this is clearly a man-made intervention that favours certain forms of biodiversity over others and supports the view that Hamford Water is man-made, as opposed to a natural, environment.</li> </ul>	
64	Ms Emma Wreathall	Bradwell Power Generation Company Limited	<p>Given the position of national policy, it is considered appropriate that the Essex Coast RAMS SPD recognises Bradwell as a potentially suitable site for a new nuclear power station. ECC and MDC both recognise the Bradwell B power station as a significant infrastructure project within the Essex county and which reaffirms the need to take the Project into account within the new Essex Coast RAMS SPD.</p> <p>The spatial extent of the Zone of Influence for the Essex Coast RAMS (Figure 3.1) includes the Bradwell B nomination site boundary. It therefore follows that BRB GenCo has an interest in the RAMS proposals which may be of relevance in the context of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and HRA studies that it will need to complete to support a Development Consent Order application (and other regulatory consents) for a proposed nuclear power station.</p> <p>BRB GenCo has initiated a programme of baseline surveys to characterise the abundance distribution and behaviour of birds within a potential Zone of Influence of the proposed power station site. In due course, the results of these surveys will inform the EIA and HRA for the development. This survey work can make a contribution to the evidence base that is available to inform the targeting and deployment of mitigation measures to ensure that they are</p>	Noted. The implementation of specific communication and any joint-working can begin once the Delivery Officer is appointed. No amendment proposed.



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>proportionate and appropriate given the range of pressures that may be prevalent as a result of new development proposals (either alone or in-combination).</p> <p>BRB GenCo looks forward to the opportunity to continue working with key stakeholders to ensure that effects arising from other developments can be taken into account during the forthcoming EIA and HRA studies for the Bradwell B Project.</p>	
65	Mr Matt Verlander	Avison Young on behalf of the National Grid	We have reviewed the above document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	Noted. No amendments proposed.
66	Ms Michelle Curtis	Tollesbury Parish Council	<p>It is difficult for the Parish Council to be brought in at this late stage. Especially as we are not even listed under partnership working whereas 'local clubs and societies' are. Had we been included we would have shared our local knowledge which would have shown you that 'aerial disturbance' (page 38) was not the only form of disturbance present in the parish.</p> <p>On page 44 (also p102 A10.5) we feel that the discussion of mitigation options is rather limited and your concentration on Maldon should possibly be reviewed. Has not the District Council established Tollesbury as an access hub for the estuary?</p> <p>On page 52 under Habitat Creation, your comment that artificial islands 'may' fit in the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP). From our experience, having the largest artificial island in the Blackwater in the Parish, they do fit in with the SMP so we suggest the word 'may' is removed.</p> <p>It is of concern to the PC that the governance of this whole project is still being discussed (p68) with no reference to any feedback from local sources of information. This project is apparently to run until 2038. Might there not be some value to some two-way communication and representation with Parish Councils to ensure that the project remains fit for purpose?</p>	A consistent approach was adopted in collecting information to establish the RAMS baseline. The suggested actions are considered relevant for exploration by the Delivery Officer, once appointed, as is the implementation of the RAMS in practice. No amendment proposed.



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
67	Ms Heather Biner	Resident	<p>The new Local Plan is unsound. The congestion around this area is already unacceptable. The roads cannot handle an increase in traffic especially at rush hour. The pollution levels in some places are already at dangerous levels. Some parts of the area are already at risk of flooding. The GPs, hospitals, schools and other services are already stretched to breaking point. The infrastructure is not in place nor is the space to add it. As well as the detrimental affect it would have on our wildlife and precious natural spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. The Maldon Local Plan was found to be sound in 2017 and was been approved by the Secretary of State in July 2017. These comments are related to the Local Plan in question rather than the SPD. No amendments proposed.</p>
68	Mr Shane Robinson	The British Association for Shooting and Conservation	<p>The Birds Directive fully recognises the legitimacy of hunting of wild birds as a form of sustainable use. Wildfowling is an activity that provides significant social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits in the UK. Wildfowling clubs also have a longstanding reputation for their conservation activities. Their understanding of the sites they manage and willingness to work together to the greater good of the site should be embraced.</p> <p>BASC is concerned that the creation of new residential development along the Essex coast will lead to increased visitor pressure on designated sites. Wildfowling clubs own and lease saltmarsh and foreshore along the Essex coast.</p> <p>Wildfowling along the Essex coast is consented by Natural England and has already been approved as having no likely significant effect on the features of designated sites. We are concerned that the proposed mitigating measures in the consultation documents will not address increased visitor pressure associated with new residential development along the Essex coast.</p> <p>We are concerned that when new residential development inevitably leads to increased visitor pressure that regulated activities such as wildfowling will be targeted as a means of addressing failures with RAMS. Bye-laws restricting walking and walking with dogs could mitigate increased visitor pressure.</p> <p>Preventing or restricting any further residential development along the Essex coast is the most appropriate means of mitigating increased visitor pressure.</p>	<p>The suggested actions are considered relevant for exploration by the Delivery Officer, once appointed, as is the implementation of the RAMS in practice. Distribution of housing growth is a matter for LPA Local Plans. No amendment proposed.</p>





### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			We would like to meet with the RAMS team as soon as possible to discuss our concerns and those of wildfowling clubs with you.	
69	Ms Annie Gordon	Essex Wildlife Trust	<p>We wish to register our concern that neither Essex Wildlife Trust, the RSPB or the National Trust were included in the steering group for the development of the RAMS project. All three NGOs have significant coastal landholdings either including, or directly adjacent to, Habitats sites.</p> <p>While we accept that this strategy is now widely advocated, there is a notable lack of evidence to support the assertion that the strategy is effective. It remains unclear and uncertain as to whether the proposed mitigation will be deliverable and whether it can be guaranteed for the long term. Using a precautionary approach, we therefore cannot agree with the HRA conclusion of no adverse effects on integrity (AEOI) of Habitats sites and their features of interest. There is no basis in evidence to support this conclusion. Endorsement of the strategy by Natural England is not, in itself, a guarantee of its effectiveness. Natural England is subject to the "Growth Duty" under Section 108 of the Deregulation Act 2015. This means it is required to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth and must consider "the importance for the promotion of economic growth of exercising the regulatory function in a way which ensures that regulatory action is taken only when it is needed, and any action taken is proportionate."</p> <p>We wish to point out that the precautionary principle needs to be applied as one of the three tests of the Habitats Regulations. There is no reference to this fundamental principle in the Essex RAMS document. Instead the strategy refers to pragmatism; we have serious concerns that economic "pragmatism" may be used to undermine the protection of internationally important habitats and species. The Essex RAMS should be based on a precautionary approach; to do otherwise risks facilitating development that does not meet the criteria for sustainability.</p> <p>In respect of personal watercraft we are of the opinion that a published Code of Conduct will fail to deliver the much-needed change in behaviour. We do not accept the claim that this strategy will be an effective measure against</p>	<p>The RSPB and EWT were invited to both of the preliminary workshops essential to devising the RAMS and the RSPB provided valuable support for the RAMS and BirdAware. Only the partner LPAs and Natural England were involved in the steering group as the RAMS and SPD are considered technical Local Plan documents. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The need for and focus of the Essex RAMS has stemmed from the recommendations of the LPAs' Local Plan HRA/AAs and is not a document that needs to meet the Habitats Regulations Assessment regulations in and of itself. Section 2.15 of the SPD sets out that, 'the RAMS approach is fair and seeks to mitigate the additional recreational pressure in a way that ensures that those responsible for it, pay to mitigate it</p>



## APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>personal watercraft misuse. A much more robust package of enforcement measures is needed to address this issue.</p> <p>Table 6.2 Potential for disturbance of birds in Hamford Water states that: "Skippers Island has regular visits by a volunteer warden who speaks to visitors" - We wish to point out that the current Skipper's Island warden is a volunteer who is only onsite occasionally (once a month on average).</p> <p>"The Colne Point is wardened and as such is likely to be resilient to increased visitor impacts" - Once again, the warden of Colne Point is only onsite occasionally; for most of the time the site is not patrolled. It is false to claim that Colne Point has resilience to increased visitor impacts.</p> <p>"St Osyth Stone Point and Brightlingsea Creek is another area where potential conflict could take place, however these areas are relatively remote" - St Osyth Stone Point is not remote, it is the pick-up point for the Brightlingsea Foot Ferry and therefore has a relatively high footfall when the ferry is running during the Spring and Summer season.</p> <p>In conclusion, while we recognise the need for the RAMS, we are of the opinion that the current iteration of the strategy is flawed and does not fully accord with the principles underpinning the Habitats Regulations. In its current form there are unsubstantiated claims of effectiveness, a failure to adopt the precautionary approach and a lack of robustness in some of the mitigation measures proposed. We would urge that these matters are addressed, and the revised version subjected to further consultation.</p>	<p>at a level consistent with the level of potential harm. It also obeys the 'precautionary principle'. Existing visitor pressure at Habitats sites would be mitigated through alternative means and any pressure that would arise from different types of development would be addressed through the project HRA'. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Once appointed, the Delivery Officer will engage with local key stakeholders on the implementation of the project. No amendment proposed.</p>
70	Mr Barrie Stone	Resident	Wildlife mitigation on Wallasea Island has already been done.	Noted. No amendment proposed.
71	Ms Anna Roe	Ipswich Borough Council	Regarding Figure 3.1 which shows the Zones of Influence for the Blackwater Estuary, Stour Estuary and Hamford Water stretching into the Suffolk Coast RAMS area. I am concerned that this could be confusing for developers of new dwellings in south Suffolk, as it implies that a contribution is required to the Essex Coast RAMS, in addition to the Suffolk Coast RAMS. Can I please	An amendment to the relevant map in the SPD and RAMS is proposed, which will remove all areas of Suffolk from the Zone of Influence.



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			request that figure 3.1 is amended to clarify that the Essex Coast RAMS tariff area stops at the Essex Boarder, I attach a map of the Suffolk Coast RAMs Zone of Influence to illustrate my point.	
72	Mr Sam Hollingworth	Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Chelmsford Garden Village Consortium	<p>The RAMS SPD does not appear to acknowledge the difference between the delivery of homes, and population increase. All three of the tests within Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations must be met when requesting contributions. As such, it is essential that the RAMS SPD will only require contributions to be made where they are to mitigate impacts which inter alia are directly related to the development in question. They cannot be used simply to address an existing situation, or a situation that would arise irrespective of the development in question. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between the impacts of development and those that are simply of population increase which would have occurred regardless.</p> <p>The total number of new homes planned within the combined Zone of Influence does not reflect the total number of new homes required to meet the projected population growth. A number of Essex Local Planning Authorities' strategic housing policies are out-of-date, and do not meet current projection and household projections. By formulating a strategy based on mitigating population growth, but then introducing a per-dwelling charge to fund this based on current allocations which are not sufficient to meet this population growth, the current allocations will be required to make a disproportionately large contribution to the mitigation.</p> <p>We note reference in Table 2.3 to the brief for the preparation of the RAMS that this included identifying measures that have already been funded and providing details in respect of current funding mechanisms. Separately, we note reference at paragraph 6.6 of the RAMS the potential for Local Planning Authorities to identify mitigation measures to be provided through separate funding streams, citing the Local Growth Fund and Local Enterprise Partnership. However, the RAMS appears to conclude that full costs of the mitigation strategy (plus a further 10% contingency allowance) be borne by new developments, without explaining how alternative sources of funding have been explored.</p>	<p>It is proposed that an amendment explaining more clearly the relationship between the effects of a population increase resulting from net new dwelling increases is included within the SPD.</p> <p>The extent of each Local Plan's housing growth has been identified consistently, for the purposes of the RAMS and SPD, for all LPAs in determining a total number of new dwellings. Section 4.5 of the SPD acknowledges that 'this figure is not definitive and likely to change as more Local Plans progress. As such the figure will be subject to review.'</p> <p>No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036 which includes the policy requirement for the RAMS, has been found 'sound' by an independent Planning Inspector.</p> <p>The tariff can only be applied to applications from a base date and cannot be collected retroactively on consented proposals despite some proposals being included</p>



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>The PPG2 confirms that policies on planning obligations should be set out in plans and examined in public, and informed by a proportionate assessment of viability. It goes on to expressly state that Supplementary Planning Documents should not be used to set out formulaic approaches to planning obligations, as these would not be tested through examination. We consider that the RAMS SPD should take a far less negative stance in respect of alternatives to simply making a financial contribution, and it would benefit from providing further guidance and/or flexibility to those wishing to implement alternatives. Furthermore, by addressing such alternatives, this will help ensure that it is consistent with emerging Local Plan policies which, as already discussed, acknowledge there may be situations where it would be inappropriate to require financial contributions to RAMS.</p> <p>There is a concern, as a matter of principle, that seeking contributions from developers to mitigate the impact of activity being actively promoted by others is questionable.</p> <p>In terms of how costs have been calculated, it is unclear what assumptions have been made in respect of overheads on top of salary costs for the staff identified as being needed. We suggest that, in the interests of transparency, this should be clearly set out. We suggest that the RAMS SPD needs to carefully consider whether it is indeed actually the case that all items proposed to be funded through developer contributions are necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms.</p>	<p>within Local Plans. Consented proposals help define the baseline position, and the suite of mitigation costed and included within the SPD in Appendix 1 is suitable to both address these effects as well as those of unconsented proposals without exponentially increasing the costs of the mitigation package. A proposed amendment setting out this position more clearly is proposed.</p> <p>Bespoke alternatives to the tariff approach will be considered at the development management stage to ensure they are proportionate and suitable on a case-by-case basis. Alternative sources of funding for the mitigation package have not been explored as it is not considered appropriate for funds to be diverted from other sources when the HRA/AAs of the LPA Local Plans has associated the significance of the in-combination effects the RAMS seeks to mitigate directly to new housing growth. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>It is a requirement of the Habitats Regulations Assessment</p>





**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
				<p>Regulations that ‘in-combination’ effects are considered. Other schemes not related to Local Plans growth will be subject to their own HRA/AA requirements if relevant. No amendment required.</p> <p>Amendments clearly setting out how overheads and other costs have been identified within the RAMS mitigation package are proposed within the SPD.</p>
73	Hannah Thomas-Davies	DWD Property + Planning on behalf of Countryside	<p>We consider that the SPD should provide more detailed wording to confirm the process for defining an alternative to paying into the RAMS. We consider that the SPD would be more effective if it clearly set out the process for agreeing bespoke mitigation for strategic sites. The SPD seeks the mitigation to the Essex Coast SPAs by one method, the payment towards a mitigation fund, however, strategic sites offer alternative methods to attain the protection of the Coastal SPAs from recreational use.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.9 make reference to tourist accommodation and states it ‘may be likely to have significant effects on protected habitat sites. We do not consider this is an acceptable description of the potential impacts of tourist accommodation on the coastal SPAs. Rather than leaving this to a case-by-case assessment the SPD should include measures to mitigate tourist development on the coastal habitat as well as the recreational pressure posed by residential development.</p> <p>Further clarification is required detailing how the total number of dwellings figure of 72,907 was calculated. Appendix 1 provides a transparent breakdown of the mitigation package costed for 2018-2038, however the calculation used to determine the number of homes to be delivered is not clear. We are concerned that the 72,907 figure underestimates the potential number of homes delivered by the 12 LPAs within the period to 2038. By using a correct,</p>	<p>Bespoke alternatives to the tariff approach will be considered at the development management stage to ensure they are proportionate and suitable on a case-by-case basis. Appropriate alternatives could take various forms and are likely to differ from case to case. For this reason, developers of strategic sites are encouraged to engage with the relevant LPA for specific guidance on what is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The RAMS and SPD has been devised specifically to address the effects of Local Plan growth within the LPA areas. As ensuring a sufficient supply of dwellings through Plan periods is a requirement of Local Plans, including tourist accommodation</p>



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>much higher, figure of additional housing this would have the effect of reducing the tariff per property levied.</p> <p>The cost of mitigation has not been included as a planning policy requirement in recent Local Plan viability assessments. This additional cost burden brought forward by the Councils late in the Local Plan process will mean that viability assessments of individual applications may become necessary to demonstrate whether or not the additional cost burden can be viably delivered.</p> <p>We consider that the calculation of housing numbers should be made more transparent, providing a description for each local authority of how the total housing figure has been calculated. This should include references to adopted and emerging development plan documents which have formed the figure.</p>	<p>proposals is not. As such, the effects of mitigating tourist accommodation, within the remit of the SPD, is considered best addressed on a case-by-case basis as and when applications for such proposals are submitted. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The extent of each Local Plan's housing growth has been identified consistently, for the purposes of the RAMS and SPD, for all LPAs in determining a total number of new dwellings. Section 4.5 of the SPD acknowledges that 'this figure is not definitive and likely to change as more Local Plans progress. As such the figure will be subject to review.' No amendment proposed.</p> <p>The subject of viability in regard to the tariff can be explored within Local Plan examinations, where deemed relevant. No amendment proposed.</p>
74	Unknown	The British Association for Shooting & Conservation	The proposed mitigating measures will not address increased visitor pressure associated with new residential development along the Essex coast. Please provide BASC with evidence of how the proposed mitigation measures will be successful in mitigating the impact of increased visitor pressure.	<p>The effectiveness of the mitigation will be monitored as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>All partner LPAS have approved the RAMS. Relevant committee</p>



### APPENDIX 3

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>Please provide information to BASC on the areas that have been identified and permissions granted to allow this work to be undertaken prior to planning consent being granted.</p> <p>Any new car parks must be located away from sensitive areas and local byelaws must be introduced to restrict the public from walking and walking with dogs. Adequate regulation and enforcement must be in place prior to planning being approved.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided on how the employment of a ranger will be sufficient mitigation for the impact of increased visitor pressure on breeding and overwintering wildfowl. Please provide BASC with information on the inclusion of the ranger's work in the HRA process.</p> <p>Please provide BASC with written confirmation that when increased visitor pressure is caused by new residential development that this will not result in additional "in combination" effects with existing wildfowling consents. We are concerned that when new residential development inevitably leads to visitor pressure increases that regulated activities such as wildfowling will be targeted as a means of addressing failures with RAMS.</p> <p>Representatives of wildfowling clubs along the Essex coast must be included in the proposed partnership approach. Merely stating that there will be some creation of salt marsh etc. will not be sufficient for an HRA process. Please provide information to BASC on the actions that would need funding. Permissions must be sought, projects must be highlighted, and plans put in place to ensure they are able to meet the conservation objectives required to mitigate the original issue.</p> <p>The HRA must include maximum permissible occupancy of those dwellings as it is the individuals within the dwelling that will increase the visitor pressure, not the dwelling itself. A precedent has been set that every application needs to be looked at on its individual merit. A blanket policy would be unlawful.</p>	<p>reports can be found on LPA websites.</p> <p>The employment of Rangers follows best practice established by existing RAMS projects and verified by Natural England through their input into the RAMS thus far. It can be considered that many of these points made can be considered by the Delivery Officer, once in post. This will include monitoring of the effectiveness of the mitigation as outlined within Section 6 of the SPD. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>'In-combination' effects are those that are identified through exploring the individual effects of those HRA/AAs undertaken for any plan or project in the area that would require compliance with the Habitats Regulations Assessment. This would include qualifying planning applications or development plans. Should an 'in-combination' effect be identified, it would be the responsibility of the new proposal to provide mitigation, not existing consented developments or activities.</p>



**APPENDIX 3**

No.	Name	Organisation	Main Issues Raised	Response / amendment required
			<p>Wildfowling actively warden the area's they manage along the Essex coast. Funding from RAMS should be allocated to wildfowling clubs to employ club representatives to assist with direct engagement with the public. Please add wildfowling clubs as key partners in the RAMS.</p> <p>A severe weather policy must be drafted to use bye-laws to restrict the public from walking or walking with dogs during periods of severe weather. See the JNCC Severe Weather Policy as a reference point.</p> <p>Preventing or restricting any further residential development along the Essex coast is the most appropriate means of mitigating increased visitor pressure.</p>	<p>It is not considered possible to calculate, or appropriate to assume, dwelling occupancy with any degree of accuracy; hence the proposed blanket tariff being applicable per net new dwelling. The tariff as proposed, will ensure that the required mitigation can be delivered to enable housing growth. No amendment proposed.</p> <p>All of the LPAs have a statutory requirement to plan for new housing growth. The RAMS seeks to mitigate recreational impacts on protected Habitats Sites on the Essex coast arising from the increase in population associated with these housing growth requirements. Each LPA Local Plan will include locational criteria-based policies to determine where growth will be permitted. No amendment proposed.</p>









This publication is available in alternative formats including large print, audio and other languages.

If required, please contact:

Place Services  
Essex County Council  
County Hall  
Chelmsford  
Essex  
CM1 1QH

Email: [ecology.placeservices@essex.gov.uk](mailto:ecology.placeservices@essex.gov.uk)

Telephone: 03330 322130

Weblink: <https://consultations.essex.gov.uk/place-services/the-essex-coast-rams-spd>

