

Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Summary of Representations, Regulation 16 Consultation

The following table provides a brief summary of representations received to the Regulation 16 Consultation which ran from 8 May until 19 June 2024.

The full comments were sent with the Submission documents to the Independent Examiner.

You can view the full contents on our Consultation Portal:

<https://consult.chelmsford.gov.uk/kse/event/37967/peoplesubmissions/>

Name	Consultation Point	Summary of response
Chelmsford City Council	General	Chelmsford City Council welcomes the opportunity to carry out formal consultation on the Submission NP. The Council has worked closely with Danbury Parish Council. The Neighbourhood Plan Group is to be commended for its hard work. It identified key themes through community consultation and has thoroughly examined each of them leading to a range of policies to influence future development and areas for protection in the Parish.
Danbury Parish Council	General	The Parish Council strongly recommends the approval of the plan.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	General	A table has been submitted setting out heights of developments or powerlines on all allocated sites above which a statutory consultation is required with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation to ensure aviation safety.
Essex County Council	General	Outlines where changes need to be made to ensure Essex County Council can deliver its statutory responsibilities, recommends minor wording changes for consideration, and signposts to other useful resources.
Essex Bridleways Association	Policy DNP14	Supports provision of PROWS. Would like to see Section 106 money used towards development/maintenance of the PROW network.
National Highways	General	The vision and objectives are supported. We would be interested to understand the proposed Priority 1 (Main Road or Maldon Road) road improvement proposal which may involve intensification of traffic growth towards A12 Junction 18.
National Trust	Policy DNP9	Two nearby sites are Sites of Special Scientific Interest which are owned and managed by the National Trust. They currently receive high levels of footfall with physical damage occurring. They will become more vulnerable as a result of the cumulative effect of more visits from the proposed allocations. We support the policy requirement for developers to work closely with the Trust and other parties to agree suitable solutions to development pressures but some amendments are sought to the policy.
Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group	Policy DNP6	DNP6 is welcome, but it does not consider endangered urban wildlife such as red-listed bird species which inhabit buildings, nor propose biodiversity enhancement integrated into the buildings of new development, e.g. swift bricks, bat boxes and hedgehog highways. Amendments are proposed to the policy as bird boxes/bricks are excluded from the DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain metric.
Mrs Jane Young	Section 5	Concerned about impact on the main road and struggling local services.
Mr Paul Coombes	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Need to consider impact on traffic including from adjacent quarry as well as on the environment and views of adjacent residents
Kevin Fursse	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about impact on traffic through the village. Loss of agricultural land and wildlife.
Mrs Lucy Bennett	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Impact on traffic/rat running, the proposed entrance is a very busy stretch near school bus stops with a blind bend. Impact on struggling local services.
Louise Hewitt	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The proposal impacts on important views from A414. Dangerous blind bend at the proposed new junction. Public Right of Way affected and impact on local roads/residents.
Mrs Deborah Nicol	General	Local infrastructure/services cannot cope.
Mrs Anne Hallett	General	Concerned about impact on traffic and struggling local services.
Mr Andrew Murtha	Para 5.7	The plan allocates 65% of new housing to a single site which contradicts the village's expressed values
Mr Andrew Murtha	Section 5	Locating the bulk of development in a less visible area suggests a strategy aimed at minimizing resistance rather than genuinely integrating new housing into the community
Mr Andrew Murtha	DNP1, Figure 5	Concentrating development significantly in one location is a planning shortcut. It lacks creativity that could balance new growth within the village landscape.
Mr Andrew Murtha	Para 4.1, Vision	Committing to 93% of the village's 15-year housing allocation at the outset limits flexibility and responsiveness to changing community need.

Mr Andrew Murtha	Para 1.27	The planning process may not adequately provide for ongoing community involvement or feedback, crucial for maintaining an approach reflecting residents' evolving needs and preferences.
Mr Andrew Murtha	Para 5.1	By not adopting an incremental approach to development, the plan misses opportunities to assess the impact of initial housing developments and adjust subsequent plans accordingly which could cause long-term negative impacts on the character and livability.
Mr Andrew Murtha	Section 6	While the plan extensively discusses preserving the village's character, the actual planning decisions such as the heavy concentration of development in one area, do not reflect these preservation principles. True preservation requires visible commitment in planning decisions.
Mr Andrew Murtha	DNP1 Table	The decision to allocate 70% of the housing to one site contrasts approaches in other areas. As it is in a less visible, less contested part of the village it seems to be circumventing potential resistance. Questions whether it adheres to the principles of a balanced and integrated community development.
Mr Keith Sandum	General	Re-iterates previous comments seeking inclusion of Ludgores Lane as a residential area in section 2 and as a key view from this lane in Policy DNP14 (now 12) and Figure 7 (now 14).
Mrs Nicola Waters	General - Assume Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about impact on traffic and air pollution.
Mrs Kate Smolen	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about impact on wildlife including breeding skylarks, owls and slow worm.
Mrs Tavia Buckingham	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about increased traffic, risk of accidents, noise pollution and impact on local wildlife.
Mr Bobby Hagger	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerns about impact on local services and traffic and risk of accidents. Destruction of wildlife habit.
Mr Matthew Ward	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerns about the impact on traffic, loss of habitats and our lifestyle.
Mr Scott Newland	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Impact on traffic, increased accident risk. Regular accidents and near misses at the blind end where the development is proposed. Local lanes are single track roads. Far to village schools and doctors which are both full. Loss of wildlife including news, bats and birds of prey.
Edward Power	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Will not retain the village character. It is a long walk to amenities and facilities and along a busy road. Dangerous access to the A414 and will increase traffic and pollution.
Mrs Victoria Ward	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of wildlife habits and the roads which are in a poor condition will suffer hugely.
Mr Philip Sands	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The surrounding road network cannot support the increase in traffic.
Mrs Diana Adams	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about traffic increase on a stretch which already has bottle-necks on a stretch where the slightest obstruction cause exceptional tail backs.
Blenheim Consultancy Services	Policy DNP1	Support the allocation of land at Danecroft, Woodhill Road. The site is available for early development and can accommodate 15 units, but no change to policy required.
Blenheim Consultancy Services	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Criterion 3 should not require referral to Natural England since the proposed development is below the 50 unit size which applies in the Danbury Common SSSI Impact Risk Zone. This should be addressed as part of the planning application. Criterion 6 should not introduce site specific control on height. This is covered by DNP4. Criterion 8 repeats criterion 4.
Mrs Jennifer Poel	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about increased traffic, pollution and risk of accidents. Lanes are only single track lanes with no passing areas or footpaths.
Dr Anthony Lipscomb	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of agricultural land, proximity to several SSSIs, impact on adjacent properties. Mitigation required to reduce impact on adjacent properties by means of a deep belt of trees, shrub and grass with native species. The walking path to be retained.
Mrs Jennifer Poel	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of agricultural land for food security and loss wildlife habitat.
Emilia Aymys	General	Concerned over impact on traffic and air pollution. Loss of nature, sense of place and community. and on local services. Local services can not cope leading to more traffic.
Mrs Abbie Hodgson	General - Assume Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned over impact on traffic which is already dangerous. Not enough amenities even for local residents.
Mrs Sue Lees	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of views and valued fields used for recreation/dog walking, there is not much open countryside each of the village. Four of the criteria in para 5.5 re site selection has not been met. Loss of gap to Maldon. Impact on traffic on narrow lanes contrary to para 5.23. Overdevelopment with 65% of the housing on one plot.
Mrs Margaret Fursse	General - Assume Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of farm land producing food crops and loss of views. Impact on local traffic including on narrow lanes.
Mr Robert Alcock	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Planning permission has been declined three times on this site. Change of character, loss of views. Impact on foundations
Mrs Judy Alcock	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	of existing properties and water table due to clay soil. The oak trees on the site must be protected. Loss of wildlife habitat

Mr Robert Alcock	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	The site has been declined planning permission a few times due to unacceptable harm to the appearance of the countryside and of the locality. Great crested newts found nearby.
Isabelle Buckingham	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of wildlife habitat and area for recreation/dog walking. Impact on traffic on main road and narrow lanes and increased risk of accidents and noise. Local doctors cannot cope.
Mr Andy Watts	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	With no physical boundary there is nothing stopping Danbury joining up with Maldon. Loss of character along with the rest of Chelmsford.
Martin Grant Homes	DNP1	Questions why Little Field adjacent to Site A has not been included in the NP, even if it has been assessed as suitable, available and achievable in 2023 - 2024 Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (May 2024). See also DNP-53
Martin Grant Homes	Site A: Land at Sandpit Field	Support for the draft allocation of Site A within the Neighbourhood Plan. Land at Little Fields support the delivery of the allocation site and can deliver up to 30 units. The NP contradicts basic conditions set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
Martin Grant Homes	Other: Land at Little Fields	The site Land at Little Fields, north of Site A: Land at Sandpit fields and adjacent to the village boundary forms a sympathetic and logical extension to Danbury in single ownership with capacity for 30 homes.
Blenheim Consultancy Services	Policy DNP9	There is no justification for the 10 unit threshold in this policy or the involvement of Natural England in a mitigation strategy.
Jacqui George	Site A: Land at Sandpit Field	Site A plans access via Littlefields but this land is privately owned so cannot happen. If development was to go ahead it would lead to increased traffic on an already busy road.
Mrs Jane Pace	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Planning permission has already been refused on this site. The access drive is very narrow and the access is already difficult to use. Delivery drivers and visitors already use our private drive to turn.
Mr Chris Higgins	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Brownfield, not greenfield should be developed. Loss of wildlife habitat.
Mr Chris Higgins	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about the increase in traffic which is already very heavy, drivers will use the narrow lanes.
Mr Chris Higgins	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about noise, congestion and pollution during construction works.
Mrs Barbara Hallett	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about traffic and impact on character of rural lanes. Loss of agricultural land and views across the fields. The footpath across the field is used for recreation/dog walking.
Mr David Hallett	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of agricultural land used for food production. The footpath across the field is used for recreation/dog walking. Impact on character of single track lane.
Mr Christopher Tressider	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of agricultural land used for food production. Increased traffic and pollution. Loss of character of single track lane. Loss of wildlife habitat with some endangered species. The footpath across the field is used for recreation.
Mr John Palmer	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The sand and gravel pit on this site was extensively objected to and many of the reasons still apply. The development could cause subsidence to adjacent properties. Increased traffic and air pollution in an area already congested, an unsuitable access and lanes which might be used for rat running. Inadequate local infrastructure. Disruption caused by new utility infrastructure. Poor road conditions. Loss of wildlife habitat, views and area used for recreation.
Mr Steve George	Site A: Land at Sandpit Field	Site on a very busy section of the main road. Impact on environment and local wildlife with adjacent land being designated a wildlife zone. Access is on private land.
Richborough	Chapter 5 and Chapter 6	The supporting text to the Housing and Development objective (page 27) is not clear and should be removed. Policy DNP1 is supported however the shape of figure 7 (Site B) is inconsistent with the shape shown in figure 5. This needs to be amended for clarity. Refer also to Appendix A. A change is sought to Criterion 1 in Site Specific Policy B to allow more flexibility to the access strategy. Criterion 3 & 8 should be amended, criteria 4 & 5 are not necessary. Policy DNP4 criterion 4 should also be amended.
Mr Stefan Todman	General	Loss of farmland.
Mrs Alison Todman	General	Loss of wildlife habitat and areas used for recreation and dog walking. Traffic is already unbearable and will get worse.
Miss Louise Jeffries	General	Lack of infrastructure such as doctors and school places. Many roads already heavily congested and some lanes are poorly maintained and cannot support large vehicles. Loss of wildlife habitats.
Mr Christopher Jones	General	Critical services already at breaking point. Highways are already congested, increased accident risks.
Mr Malcolm Reid	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Proposal is detrimental to the character of the area defined by historic housing and open grassland. Access unsuitable for frequent vehicular movement due to blind bend.
Mr Ali Mashadi	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Proposal is large, intrusive and out of character and cannot be supported by local roads and services. Inadequate space for parking.

Mrs Pennie Lipscomb	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Proposal cannot be supported by local roads and services. Destructive impact on local lanes. Loss of countryside.
Mrs Debbie Wakefield	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Local narrow lanes not suitable for the amount of houses proposed. Field used for recreation and dog walking. Unsafe access.
Mr Arthur Allen	General	Expresses concerns that his household has not been approached to take part in the development of the NP, hence the process is undemocratic. Questions the Climate and Ecological Emergency. Questions the 50% figure in 1.26. Do not believe 25% is a true representation of the views of Danbury residents. DNP1 - Site D will intensify traffic at a point with increased visibility; Site C will obliterate a children's play area, Site D is a very narrow lane with dubious visibility. Questions wordings or need for policies DNP7-DNP10 and DNP16. Believes there should be more key views in DNP12 and that there is no lack of youth play space (DNP14).
Mrs Nicola Ware	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitats and village character. Footpaths on the field are used for recreation. Main road heavily congested already causing rat running on small country lanes often without pavements creating an accident risk.
Jacqueline Murrells	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Strongly object to the proposal. Do not believe 25% is a true representation of the views of Danbury residents. Previous application have been refused on this site for 4 and 14 houses for reasons that still apply such as impact on traffic, impact on the Conservation Area and impact on adjoining properties. The access is on a blind bend with a 40mph speed limit. Loss of wildlife habitat. The proposal also conflicts with the NP objectives. Other sites are more appropriate such as extensions to Site A and B.
Dr Trevor Rees	Site E: Land at Mayes Lane	Loss of wildlife habitat. There are restrictive covenants on the area proposed for development hence I do not understand why a development of two houses is proposed. Legal documents attached. A new access will be a safety risk.
Mr Stewart Heath	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Planning permission for 4 houses has been refused previously. The proposal I would impact on highway (a 40mph road with an incline and a bend), landscape, ecology and the character of the area. A permission to improve the access has now lapsed and was for the existing properties and four dwellings. Impact on adjacent residential properties. Proposal contrary to DNP5 and DNP8.
Mrs Janet Reid	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Planning permission for 4 houses has been refused recently. Increased traffic risk with a narrow and inadequate footpath, a 40mph road used as a rat run and a blind bend. Loss of wildlife habitat in an area with outstanding biodiversity.
Mr Lee Caswell	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Increased traffic and accident risk on an already very busy road. Loss of character of country lane. Loss of agricultural land and loss of wildlife including slowworms
Mrs Kate Churchouse	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	This proposal would change the nature of the village surrounded by wildlife. Danbury is scarcely coping with current traffic. Lack of infrastructure especially doctor's surgery.
Mr Nick Harvey	Site A: Land at Sandpit Field	Access not possible as the land is privately owned and in constant use. Loss of wildlife habitat.
Mr Matthew Parsons	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Building housing on the proposed field would not only strain the inadequate facilities and exacerbate traffic problems but also lead to overdevelopment and devaluation of one of Essex's finest villages.
Emma Sexton	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Concerned about increase in traffic with the main road already heavily congested. The lanes will be used as rat runs. Increased air pollution. Loss of wildlife habitat, rural character and area used for recreation/dog walking.
Gordon Hudson	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Concerned about the safety and wellbeing of the local community. Previous applications have been refused and there is now more traffic. The property has poor access and visibility. Loss of wildlife habitat and significant impact on water table and sewerage
Toni Caswell	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of wildlife habitat and threats to the quality of life for local residents. The area is used for recreation and dog walking. The proposal would lead to an increase in traffic on the main road and local lanes, increased air pollution and risk of accidents.
Landvest Developments Ltd	Para 5.4, Policy DNP1, Policy DNP17	Object to policy DNP1 as it omits the promoted site (at the junction of Elm Green Lane and Riffhams Lane). There is no justification for classifying Elm Green Lane as a rural and protected lane (DNP17). The ecological benefits of the site should be weighed in favour of a site allocation (para 5.4).
Mr Ryan Hartles	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The proposal would damage countryside views and lead to increased traffic, noise and pollution. Loss of wildlife habitat. Negative effect on local businesses as large corporations will benefit.
Mr Martin Jackson	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of agricultural land use for food production. Loss of village character. Local amenities are already struggling. Danbury already has significant traffic issues. This development can open up for further development of the farm.

Mrs Susan Pattinson	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Loss of character and recreational space/dog walking area. No planting scheme can compensate. Development may open up floodgates for more development in this area. Main road is already very congested leading to rat running along the lanes with no pavements and in a poor condition. Increased risk of accidents. Difficult access onto Main Road. It is a not a short walk to key facilities and it is not a pleasant walk. Local facilities are at capacity and there is a lack of parking.
Mr Graeme Bennett	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Development will not be supported by existing infrastructure. The main road is already at capacity and small, narrow lanes with tight corners are used for rat running. This will increase.
Miss Sara Miller	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The proposal would add an unsustainable extra flow of traffic to an already overwhelmed main. Field used for recreation and dog walking. Local services are already full.
Mrs Nicola Gibson	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Local roads are already congested. Local lanes will be used as a rat run. Loss of field used for food production with the footpaths used by dog walkers. Loss of wildlife habitat. Development may lead to further development of the field. Suggests a more even distribution of houses or development the other end of the village closer to the A12. The local surgery is already over stretched.
Mrs Gill Carter	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The proposal will have a negative impact on the area. Local services are at capacity. The main road is always under pressure forcing traffic onto the lanes making them dangerous.
Mrs Elisa Sandle Mr Michael Sandle	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Destruction of a beautiful area surrounded by National Trust land. Development previously refused for just four houses. Loss of wildlife habitats including a newt pond and an underground stream. Development may impact on the foundation of other houses and the water table leading to flood risk. Local roads and services cannot support the proposal. Serious parking problems in the area and rat running. Loss of privacy.
Mr Robert Murrells	Foreword, Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road, Section 7, Section 11	This plan is based on an unrepresentative survey that is time obsolete and statistically and democratically unsound. Previous applications have been refused on this site. The criteria all apply today and the parish council objected strongly then. The proposal affects Key View 1 St John's Church, overlooking Hanningfield Reservoir. The plan refers to the A414 but should also include the rat run routes. Any referendum should be conditional on a majority turn out.
Mr Richard Sandlan	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	This proposal seems disproportionate to other site allocations. Amenities are already at capacity. There are congestion each morning leading to rat runs through narrow lanes. Far from local services being on the edge of the village. Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat housing protected species such as skylarks, badgers and bats.
Blenheim Consultancy Services	Policy DNP4	Questions the height restrictions imposed by para 5.62 which does not seem to relate to the policy text.
Gleeson Land	General	Gleeson Land supports the intention of the NP to meet the needs of local people. The NP could increase the number of homes allocated to at least meet the adopted Local Plan figure of 100. The representation promotes a 3.6ha site called Land North of Runsell Lane to the west of the village for market and affordable housing.
Mrs Sarah Power	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	There is a high risk of accidents already and we already have to take detours to get around Danbury. Entering and leaving the planned development will cause many accidents and lead to delays. The biggest concern is risk to child safety if families or children on their own cross here, even on a pedestrian crossing due to poor visibility and country lane feel of the area. The site is far from both schools and services on foot.
Mr David Nichols	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	The impact on the housing market with this development would be negligible in the light of the large housing developments in Maldon, Beaulieu and Hammonds Farm but the damage to Danbury cannot be underestimated. Several applications have been rejected previously for this site. Concerned over increased strains on roads, schools and local services and increased risk of accidents.
Mrs Helen Quill	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Danbury has already seen a huge increase in traffic due to the developments in Maldon and Heybridge. The proposal will caused increased traffic, noise and pollution and more rat running on local lanes. Loss of agricultural land used for food production. Local services already over stretched. Loss of recreation land, areas used for dog walking and wildlife habitat.
Mrs Hazel Green	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Allocation of 14 homes on this plot contradicts Danbury Design Guide para 2.2 Density & Views. This is supported by para 3.6 in the NP referring to parking which should be on plot where possible further diminishing plot size and density. Retaining or replacing trees would also not be possible without reducing housing density.
Mrs Hazel Green	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	The access road is onto a 40mph stretch of Woodhill Road with a difficult bend, limited visibility and increasing traffic. Speed mitigation is required along Woodhill Road.
Mrs Hazel Green	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	A full scale environmental study should be undertaken to determine the existence of protected species as doormice has been found on the site boundary. Appropriate mitigation is required.

Mr Max Campbell	General	Danbury lacks the infrastructure to support more homes, with only one major road through Danbury and many single track roads around it, traffic would be forced onto the backroads causing congestion and making roads unsafe. Our beautiful green spaces and delicate ecosystems, many of which are SSSI sites, would be at risk of destruction due to higher footfall. The rich history and quiet atmosphere of Danbury should be preserved.
Mrs Anne Jackson	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	Unnecessary expansion of village boundary when there is scope within the village to provide these properties, particularly infill development. Lack of traffic infrastructure on an already dangerous A414 position. Valuable agricultural land being destroyed.
Mr Craig Lane	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	The Parish Council objected to two previous applications on this site. The propose will detract from the rural character of the village and lead to a loss of wildlife habitats. Increased flood risk especially if mature oaks are removed. Local services already under pressure.
Mrs Karen Cooper	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	The Parish Council objected to two previous applications on this site. The propose will detract from the rural character of the village and lead to a loss of wildlife habitats. Increased flood risk especially if mature oaks are removed. Increased traffic and risk of accidents. Local services already under pressure. Loss of privacy.
Lisa Braben	Site B: Land at Tyndales Farm West	There has been so much house building in Maldon the Danbury main road cannot cope with any more developments. Loss of wildlife habitat.
Mrs Hazel Moore	Policy DNP1, DNP5, Site D: Danecroft Woodhill Road	Danecroft has been allocated for around 14 new homes. This is a much higher density than the rest of the Park neighbourhood which contravenes Policy DNP5 (8) in the NP and Danbury Design Guide section 2.2 Density and Views.
Mrs Hazel Moore	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	The proposed access to Woodhill Road is dangerous with limited visibility. Traffic mitigation is required. A full scale environmental study should be undertaken to determine the existence of protected species as doormice has been found on the site boundary. Appropriate mitigation is required. Adequate parking is essential as South View Road cannot sustain further on-road parking.
Mrs Hazel Moore	Policy DNP5	Splitting of gardens and back land developments should be avoided as both destroy the open contribution these make in all 6 of Danbury's main residential localities. Site D: Danecroft contravenes this policy.
Mr Patrick Heaphy	Site D: Danecroft, Woodhill Road	Concerned about overlooking and loss of privacy due to the height of the proposed dwellings. Loss of visual amenity currently being characterised by open space and greenery. This was a justification for a refusal of an application for 14 homes on this site. Style and density of houses not in keeping with the character of the area. Loss of mature trees and wildlife habitat.
Stonebond (Chelmsford) Ltd	General, Section 5, DNP1, DNP2, DNP17	Comments to the previous consultation remains. Representations support a site referred to as Land at Mill Lane for up to 30 dwellings and an area for recreational or ecological/biodiversity use. Updates to the NP is required to meet the basic conditions of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. A Local Highway Network Review has been submitted and the consultee has been liaising with Essex County Council to inform and focus on mitigation required as a result of the development.
Mr Kenneth Axon	Site E: Land at Mayes Lane	Support expressed for the NP, especially Site E close to where the consultee lives.
Mr and Mrs G and J Thompson and Wilson	DNP1, Site E: Land at Mayes Lane	The site would represent a logical extension to the village, within a central location and close to services and facilities. Existing hedges will be retained and new hedging will be planted. Development is both viable and deliverable. As a whole, the NP sets out an appropriate framework to develop all the site allocations in a planned and integrated manner.
Gladman Developments Ltd	Vision, Policy DNP1, Policy DNP2, Policy DNP6, Policy DNP14	The vision and objectives are broadly supported. Questions the likelihood of further dwellings coming forward as windfall. DNP2 is supported in principle but it should promote a flexibly strategy to ensure a choice of housing options. DNP6 is supported but there is no need to duplicate national and local planning policy in a NP. Challenges DNP14 (now DNP12) and believes Key View 3 should be removed. The representation supports a site at Maldon Road (Site D4) which is considered clearly capable of allocation through the NP.
Medical Services Danbury	General	The NP does not meet the basic conditions of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 required for it to proceed to referendum. A site adjacent to the Medical Centre has been proposed for development. Challenges that is has been deemed unsuitable in the third Site Options and Assessment Report due to heritage impact. A separate Heritage Assessment has been submitted.
Mr Jonathan Thombs	Site A: Land at Sandpit Field	Site A: Land at Sandpit Field assumes access via Little Fields which is privately owned land, hence it would be inappropriate to include this site in the NP until this is resolved. Concerned about impact on the heritage asset Garlands farmhouse.

Abbreviations used: NP = Neighbourhood Plan, PROW = Public Rights of Way