

Table of Responses to EDC Comments

Comment	EDC text	Response	Action
KH1	Numbered headings and paragraphs	Agree to headings	Amended
RA2	Refer to NDP covering the whole parish	See preceding paragraph	Text amended
RA3	Is this necessary	Yes it sets important context and has impact on the numbers of houses needed	Text amended
KH4,KH5	how many?	Four events during May & June 2017	Text amended
RA6	SEA text to be updated	Agree	Text amended
KH7	Amend Plan title	Agree	Title and text amended
KH8	Include estimate of change	Agree	Text amended
KH9	amend text	agree	Text amended
KH10	Ever increasing numbers at Primary school - provide figures	Not necessary	No change
KH11	Proportion of social rented?	Just 1.2%	Figure added
RA12	Titles for all images and maps	where necessary titles are shown	No change
RA13	Sense	Redrafted	text amended
KH14	Sense	Redrafted	text amended
KH15	Sense	Redrafted	text amended
RA16	Sense	redrafted	text amended
KH17	Plan	included	Text amended earlier to give page number of map
RA18	Objective too detailed	Disagree	No change
RA19	EDC considers materials	Not sufficiently	There have been fraught planning issues in the past therefore thisdocument is for for local councillors who don't have planning training.
RA20	How many spaces	'adequate' covers different development types	Text amended
KH21	Same as CCC standards?	It is for the decision maker to justify 'adequate' in relation to all material considerations	Text amended
RA22	Where are open areas	Shown on map on P8	Map added
KH23	Where are open areas	Shown on map on P8	Map added
KH24	Can this be defined	See map on p 24	Map Added and Text amended
KH25	Maintenance not land use related	Maintenance is an objective not a policy	No change

Table of Responses to EDC Comments

KH26	Where are designated amenity land and what protected from	Shown on plan - text amended	Text amended
RA27	Maintenance not land use related	Maintenance is an objective not a policy	No change
RA28	Repetition of bullet 10 Obj 1	Disagree	No change
KH29	No need for appropriate	Agree	Text amended
RA30	Sense	Minor redrafting	Text amended
RA31	Not NPPF compliant	Disagree	Text amended
KH32	Appropriate?	It is for the decision maker to justify 'appropriate' in relation to all material considerations, but should only be considered with the Village Character Area	Text amended
RA33	Not land use planning	Issue is an objective not policy	
RA34	Not land use planning	Issue is an objective not policy	No change
KH35	Character not related to build rate	Slow build incorrect terminology	Text amended
RA36	Too restrictive not NPPF compliant	Disagree	Morland Parish Councillors felt this attention to detail was vital
RA37	Too restrictive not NPPF compliant	Disagree but softened	Text amended
KH38	Which area	applies to all areas	No change
RA39	bullets 2, 4 and 5 are superfluous	Local experience suggests otherwise	No change
RA40	How is this to be judged?	Normal DM processes would be used	No change
RA41	Too vague	Disagree but	Text amended
RA42	Move to Objectives	Agree NDP should not refer to another document	Deleted
RA43	From What	Text reworded	Text reworded
RA44	How	Text reworded	Text reworded
RA45	Consider splitting the policy	Agree but reorder only	Text reordered
KH46	Reference to the whole of the parish outside the development area?	Yes	No change required
RA47	Too onerous	Yes	Text amended
RA48	Reference to 1996 Amenity Open Space should be removed	Agree	Text amended
RA49	Clarify which proposals map	Agree	Text amended

Table of Responses to EDC Comments

RA50	even outside the VCA?	Yes we are supporting developments which reflects the character area, regardless of location	No change
RA51	Sense	agree	amend to 'low impact'
RA52	Cannot prejudge weight. Contrary to NPPF	Disagree - see NPPF172	no change
RA53	Contrary to NPPF	Disagree - see NPPF172	no change
RA54	Bullets are easier to read	No issue	no change
RA55	The Plan should list all features of importance	Agree	Text amended
RA56	Cannot enhance something that doesnt exist	Agree	Text amended
KH57	better parking?	Yes	Text amended
RA58	Not clear	Yes	Text amended
RA59	What sort of development?	See response to RA60	No change
RA60	What is appropriate?	Different sorts of development will require different provision of amenity space appropriate to the location. Eg housing would require more than new shop front	No change
RA61	Meaning?	Meaning will be clear in context of a proposal.	No change
RA62	Structural planting not Land Use	Yes	Deleted
RA63	Is this feasible?	Yes	No change
RA64	Clarification?	yes	text amended
RA65	More positive	agree	Text amended
RA66	Unacceptable?	unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity	Text amended
RA67	Amenity	yes	Text amended
KH68	Tuer's garage?	Yes	Text amended
RA69	Meaning?	Character of Tuers garage is identifiable	Text amended
KH70	Will be	agree	Text amended
KH71	Resident or general Parking?	It could be either as both would remove parking from the highway	No change
RA72	Parking enhancing the character of the village?	If well designed	No change
RA73	Not development form	Agree	Text amended

Table of Responses to EDC Comments

RA74	differential weight	NPPF applies weight differential at 115 and 72, 63	No change
KH75	No ref to older peoples housing	Agree	Text amended
RA76	min parking standards	Agree	No change necessary
RA77	CS superseded	Hopefully	Wait and see
RA78	Amendments to flood risk amenity land and listed buildings plan	Agree	Plan altered
KH79	number Heritage assets	Not necessary	No change
RA80	Change terminology	agree	Text amended
RA81	Remove reference to 1996 designation of Local Amenity Spaces	agree	Text amended
KH82	Cross referenced on plan	Not necessary	No change
KH83	Cross referenced on plan	Not necessary	No change