

Policy 1

The third and fourth components of the policy helpfully identify the need for the Plan to be monitored and reviewed. However as included in the policy it does not take on a policy format. I am minded to recommend a modification so that the third and fourth components are repositioned into Section 19 (Implementation and Monitoring) Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Agreed.

Policy 2

The first part of the policy is also a statement rather than a policy. Is the Parish Council's intention to have a policy which would support infill development where it met the identified criteria (a-g)?

Yes. That is the intention. Only within the development boundary.

Policy 4

The first part of the policy comments about 'encouraging' certain types of proposals. In policy terminology 'encouraging' has little if any effect. I am minded to recommend a modification so that the use of encouraging is replaced by 'should provide where practicable and viable' Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

We agree with this proposed recommendation.

Policy 5

This is an interesting and distinctive policy. In the first part developers are asked to consider four criteria, I am minded to recommend a modification so that 'consider' is replaced by 'take into account' Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition? Does the second part of the policy address footpath connections between the Park and the surrounding urban areas?

Agree with changing "consider" to "taking into account". The second part of the policy aims to help new developments connect to existing footpaths or provide new ones where appropriate.

Policy 6

Para 14.4 comments that specific assessments have been made for each proposed Local Green Space. For my clarity is that work shown in Appendix 2 of the Plan?

No, LGS work is within Appendix 3.

Policy 7

I understand the principles behind the policy. In relation to third part of the policy to what extent would the approach differ from the application of general countryside policies elsewhere in the neighbourhood area? To what extent has the Parish Council sought to use natural or man-made features to define the boundaries of the proposed Green Gaps?

This policy is more about preserving the green open countryside between existing settlements and limiting the further spread of development.

Green Gap 1 follows a natural stream to the south and Langold Country Park and the built boundary of Langold to the North.

Green Gap 2 follows the boundary of the planning permission to the south, road and hedge line boundaries to the East and West, and the boundary of the B6463 to the North. This GG also complies to the proposed one identified for Langold in the Local Plan.

Policy 9

This policy reads well in general terms However, on what basis did the Parish Council decide to use the 0.5 hectares figure in the second criterion? Would the criterion be more flexible to business needs and yet still address environmental issues if it took a more general format and commented about a size appropriate to the part of the neighbourhood area in which it was proposed to be located?

This could be changed to reflect NPPF of up to and including 1ha in size?

Policy 10

In the first part of the policy is the list of activities intended to be an exclusive list? If not, could the list of specific uses be relocated into the supporting text?

Yes, the list could be included in the supporting text.

Am I correct in assuming that it is intended to be applied to the heritage assets identified in the relevant figures and Appendix 2? Yes, that is correct.