

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
CP4	1	Postive to see that village has a village maintenance plan and biodiversity plan	Noted	None	No response required
CP9 to CP12	1	Could include a requirement where a proposal enhances and improves a range of community facilities, whether it is creating an outdoor sports facility or repurposing a community facility, then these facilities through their design deliver multiple functions, not just a single purpose use (hence forming a part of the GI network). Proposed text is provided.	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	These are Community Policies rather than Planning ones so the policy statements have been amended to lose the ambiguity caused by referencing a development area.
Env	1	Whilst a number of policies contribute to the Green Infrastructure network, there could be opportunity to identify any GI deficiencies and new green spaces and types of green facilities in need, as well as provision of new open spaces as part of new development. This could lead to an additional policy on GI covering. Proposed text is provided.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	This is agreed although for clarity only one new GI policy is thought to be required. We will look at suggestion and compare with PP8. The suggestion could affect several policies.
Env	1	There is no policy on climate change or flooding. There is scope to plan for long-term resilience and consider measures to adapt and mitigate from climate change. Examples provided and signpost to guidance provided by the CSE.	Noted	Add text	Confirmed development sites are in Flood Zone 1. Additional explanatory text has been inserted in the NP document on flooding and SuDS
Env	1	The Plan could mention its position on renewable energy (for both residential and commercial) including wind turbines, battery pods and renewable heat initiatives. While much of this is covered in Building Regs., the Plan could influence new development e.g. by requiring developers to demonstrate how they've followed the energy hierarchy in reducing energy demand before implementing renewable energy, or make the most of solar gain and passive cooling through the orientation, layout and design of the development.	Agree	Add text	ADD to text: Developers will be required to demonstrate how they've followed the energy hierarchy in reducing energy demand before implementing renewable energy, or make the most of solar gain and passive cooling through the orientation, layout and design of the development.
Environment	1	Include a map of Local Wildlife Sites as well as some supporting information. There are nine in the parish. The Parish Council should consider declaring one or two of these as Statutory Local Nature Reserves, if appropriate.	Agree	Add text	Add to maps
Gen	1	Planned scale of growth is in conformity with Local Plan.	Noted	None	No response required
Gen	1	Supporting Infrastructure and Action Plan is ambitious - Parish Council should ensure ongoing discussions with ECC and e.g. bus companies	Noted	Add text	Text to be added to monitoring section: The PC will seek to have regular contact with ECC, bus companies etc.
Gen	1	NDP has provided context on matters regarding minerals and waste.	Noted	None	No response required
Gen	1	Supports the overall, postive vision for the Plan	Noted	None	No response required

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
Gen	1	Sustainable development: Recommend considering including an overarching policy stating support for sustainable development. It could state that only developments that can show that the scheme will be instrumental in achieving the community vision and objectives outlined in the Plan will be encouraged. The policy could summarise the criteria developments are required to meet including: size, design standards and materials of homes; infrastructure associated with leisure and recreation; maximise environmental/green assets; improve access to the countryside and open spaces; use of renewable technology; protection of landscape character and heritage, cultural and natural assets.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	This has been incorporated within the main body of the NP text and a new umbrella policy added. Text to be inserted into sustainable development section: Proposals that show that the scheme will be instrumental in achieving the community vision and objectives outline in the plan will be encouraged.
PP1	1	Could include a requirement where a proposal enhances and improves a range of community facilities, whether it is creating an outdoor sports facility or repurposing a community facility, then these facilities through their design deliver multiple functions, not just a single purpose use (hence forming a part of the GI network). Proposed text is provided.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy PP1 to be amended to make it clearer that there is flexibility in the approach.
PP10	1	Should consider proposals first to adequately mitigate the impacts and then to require adequate compensatory provision to be made through biodiversity/environmental offsetting and/or replacement provision to deliver environmental/biodiversity net gains. (Rather than replacing like for like).	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy amended to reflect correct order.
PP10	1	Signpost developers to Essex Biodiversity Validation Checklist, which is a requirement for all 'major' development applications. Weblink provided.	Noted	Add text	This will be added to the text of the NP
PP10	1	Supporting text could be strengthened to include more context about the reasons for creating green corridors and green spaces to support wildlife.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Additional text in policy to reflect this although this will be confined to one policy area under GI rather than necessarily being mentioned in every policy statement
PP11	1	Supporting text could be strengthened to include more context about the reasons for creating green corridors and green spaces to support wildlife.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Additional text in policy to reflect this although this will be confined to one policy area under GI rather than necessarily being mentioned in every policy statement
PP11	1	Requirement for financial contributions to RAMS might need to be set out in the document. Background text is provided for use.	Agree	Add text	Addition text under new paragraph on Essex Coast RAMS
PP12	1	Allocated two sites for collectively up to 120 dwellings. The emerging Local Plan does not allocate sites in WB, instead allowing for their identification and allocation to be made within the WBNP. The WBNP will need to justify the allocation of the two sites in light of reasonable alternatives - this cannot be done without an SEA having been undertaken - Recommendation is that an SEA is undertaken as soon as possible and consulted on. (NOTE: this is contrary to email from Shelley Blackaby on 2 August 2018)	Noted	None	This is contrary to advice received by the Planning Authority
PP23	1	Support the encouragement of cycling walking and public transport - scope to include a provision for electric vehicles? Text provided including for justification	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy wording has been amended to reflect this suggestion. ADD to policy: All proposals are include to a provision for electric vehicles
PP24	1	Pleased to see support for measures to improve walking routes to the primary school	Noted	None	No response required
PP26	1	Could include a requirement where a proposal enhances and improves a range of community facilities, whether it is creating an outdoor sports facility or repurposing a community facility, then these facilities through their design deliver multiple functions, not just a single purpose use (hence forming a part of the GI network). Proposed text is provided.	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	PP9 has been deleted and is now contained within another policy statement.
PP32	1	Support the encouragement of cycling walking and public transport - scope to include a provision for electric vehicles? Text provided including for justification	Noted	None	No response required
PP37	1	Support the encouragement of cycling walking and public transport - scope to include a provision for electric vehicles? Text provided including for justification	Noted	None	No response required

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP37	1	Connectivity: Potential for a new policy (under General Housing, or Transport, or within PP37) that takes into consideration the integration of development and green spaces to improve connectivity between wildlife areas. Example text provided.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Additional text in policy to reflect this although this will be confined to one policy area under GI rather than necessarily being mentioned in every policy statement
PP8	1	Should consider proposals first to adequately mitigate the impacts and then to require adequate compensatory provision to be made through biodiversity/environmental offsetting and/or replacement provision to deliver environmental/biodiversity net gains. (Rather than replacing like for like).	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy wording to be amended to make the sequence of considerations read better.
PP9	1	Could include a requirement where a proposal enhances and improves a range of community facilities, whether it is creating an outdoor sports facility or repurposing a community facility, then these facilities through their design deliver multiple functions, not just a single purpose use (hence forming a part of the GI network). Proposed text is provided.	Noted	None	PP9 has been deleted and is now contained within another policy statement.
PP9	1	Postive to see a policy on roadside planting and hedgerows.	Noted	None	No response required
PP10	2	Strengthen the policy to make it clear that SuDSs will be utilised for surface water disposal on development sites in the parish unless it can be shown to be technically unfeasible.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	SUDS will be picked up in a policy statement and supporting text. This will be in one of our policies not necessarily all of them.
PP12	2	Improvements to the existing foul sewerage network are expected to be required to enable the development of the two site allocations based upon an initial assessment. Ref to this requirement should be made in the policy.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	SUDS will be picted up in a policy statement and supporting text. This will be in one of our policies not necessarily all of them.
CP6	3	The policy supports natural capital assets in protecting and maintaining them as well as creating new natural habitats and enhancing the natural capital in West Bergholt. Additional text provided for inclusion to encourage collaborative approach and reference to SuDSs in terms of building green infrastructure into design.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	SUDS and a collaborative approach will be picked up in a policy statement and supporting text. This will be in one of our policies not necessarily all of them
CP7	3	The policy supports natural capital assets in protecting and maintaining them as well as creating new natural habitats and enhancing the natural capital in West Bergholt. Additional text provided for inclusion to encourage collaborative approach and reference to SuDSs in terms of building green infrastructure into design.	Noted	None	SUDS and a collaborative approach will be picted up in a policy statement and supporting text. This will be in one of our policies not necessarily all of them
CP8	3	The policy supports natural capital assets in protecting and maintaining them as well as creating new natural habitats and enhancing the natural capital in West Bergholt. Additional text provided for inclusion to encourage collaborative approach and reference to SuDSs in terms of building green infrastructure into design.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	SUDS and a collaborative approach will be picted up in a policy statement and supporting text. This will be in one of our policies not necessarily all of them!
Env	3	There is no mention of areas at risk of flooding in the Plan. You could enhance the Plan by ensuring that development proposed within Flood Zone 2 or 3 are identified. Any current proposed development or proposed development in these zones should be sequentially sited, and the applications should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The NP should apply the sequential test and use a risk based approach to the location of future development. It should be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and should use the NPPF PPG: Potential text to include is provided.	Noted	None	No development is proposed for zones in these flood zone areas. Confirmed development sites in Flood Zone 1.
Gen	4	No specific comments. Ref to general guidance on incorporating historic environment considerations into NPs.	Noted	Add text	The reference to Historic England's advice on NPs will be incorporated with the NP supporting text

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP10	5	Policy could be strengthened with the removal of the word appropriate . Development should look to achieve net gain and it is felt this could be better reflected in the wording. No objections to the intentions of the policy. There is no policy for the requirement of high quality green infrastructure networks. (see policy SS15 (v) of Colchester Local Plan). Whilst reference has been made to 'adoption of best practice in sustainable urban drainage', recommendation is to update the policy to make reference to this GI provision or ideally this would form a separate policy to ensure sufficient green infrastructure is incorporated into the identified housing allocations.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Remove wording where appropriate, also remove second "appropriate". Add GI to PP12. change last sentence of the policy to make sense!
PP11	5	Essex Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) has begin development and is therefore a relevant issue for the NP. Inclusion of Policy PP11 is positive and Natural England supports it.	Noted	None	No response required
PP12	5	There is reference to site allocations totalling 120 (minimum) dwellings. And also reference to windfall development. Any windfall applications which would be in excess of what has been assessed in the HRA would need to be subject to their own HRA.	Noted	None	This will be a downstream matter for future Planning Applications.
CP12	6	Consider incorporating into the site allocations policy (will give it greater weight).	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	CP 12 is a community policy and the reference to the proposed sports area has been deleted.
CP4	6	Remove - repeats PP8	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Text amended to "not normally be supported" which is a better worded phrase and the repetition inherent in the last sentence of the policy has been removed.
CP7	6	Merge with revised open space/local green space policies	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Review once we have a revised LGS policy and amendments to PP2. may have a relationship with Local Green Infrastructure
CP8	6	Merge with area of separation	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	This is agreed as an approach and now reflected in the revised policies, supporting text and mapping
CP9	6	Consider incorporating into the site allocations policy (will give it greater weight).	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	CP 9 is a community policy and the reference to the proposed sports area has been deleted.
Gen	6	For clarity, consider numbering the criteria in the policies and using paragraph numbers for the supporting text.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	A selective use of numbering will apply to the policies and NP text for clarity and ease of reference .
Housing - General	6	Further combine the policies: 1 criteria based policy for the allocated sites (PP12, PP23,PP24, PP25, PP26); 1 criteria based policy for windfalls/extensions (PP13, PP14, PP15, PP16, PP17, PP20); a policy for agricultural buildings (PP18, PP19); and a policy for rural exception sites (PP21).	Noted	None	No change proposed as too long a policy statement would result.
Housing - General	6	The housing allocations policy should include a requirement for strategic open space and links to WB's public rights of way and green infrastructure network.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy amended with the added wording "development should include some public open space " in PP12
Housing Supply and Tenure type	6	Make the Report on the Assessment of Potential Housing Sites available on the consultation website or append to the NP	Agree	Add text	This will be added to the text in the NP and in the supporting documents of Appendix 2.
Housing Supply and Tenure type	6	Amend or remove the first bullet point (unclear if this refers to sites abutting but inside the settlement boundary, allocated sites outside the settlement boundary (but the NP redraws the settlement boundary so that these sites are now within the settlement boundary) or unallocated sites outside the settlement boundary).	Agree	Add text	Amend to reflect the date from when the principles would have applied ie CBC's Local Plan

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP12	6	Map - Remove reference to modification to the settlement boundary and draw the settlement boundary around the allocated sites. A para on windfalls has been removed - is this intentional? Or is it hidden behind the map? Remove/ amend requirement for a 12-metre strip of land. (not a usable public open space). Unsure about the final sentence about removing Permitted Development rights - if an aspiration, include as supporting text	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Map to be redrawn. 12m strip can stay however as will not be defined as LGS. Disagree on permitted development rights removal.
PP15	6	Consider removing (dormers could be included as part of loft conversions under permitted development)	Noted	None	Not all do though so disagree
PP18	6	Consider removing (a lot of agricultural buildings and conversions fall under permitted development rights)	Noted	None	Not all do though so disagree
PP19	6	Consider removing (a lot of agricultural buildings and conversions fall under permitted development rights)	Noted	None	Not all do though so disagree
PP2	6	Policy needs amending as not NPPF compliant. Either ensure that LGSs meet NPPF criteria (not all do) and justify them, OR amend the policy to refer to the protection of open spaces.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	New green spaces policy is dealing with this
PP20	6	Amend of remove (unsure what is meant by 'adapted dwellings'. Difficult in practice to park in front of a property on the road).	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Change to "new or altered dwellings"
PP21	6	See comments under PP5 about Area of Separation.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Dealt with as above
PP22	6	Consider combining this policy with PP5 and CP8. If the policy remains it needs to be justified.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Dealt with as above
PP24	6	It would be better to say something along the lines of: "each development would be expected to mitigate its impact by providing improvements to ensure the site could be accessed safely, would not be detrimental in highway safety and capacity terms and could be easily accessed by pedestrians, cyclists and on public transport." (on basis of Highway Agency's comment about not being able to understand fully any mitigation until an application is submitted).	Noted	None	Improve text to give clarification to the policy.
PP25	6	Clarify if it is the land for a cemetery that is required. Consider including housing figures for each site in the policy. (i.e. how the 120 is split between the two sites)	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Land only. Consider putting numbers in the policy, NOT DONE
PP26	6	Clarify if it is the whole sports facility or just the land for it that is required. Consider including housing figures for each site in the policy. (i.e. how 120 is split between the two sites)	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy amended to show that it is land only that is required for sports field. Housing numbers to be added to each site area (ie A and B). NOT DONE
PP27	6	Include 'traffic impact' as a separate criteria.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy amended to add as a separate bullet point and carriage return etc
PP3	6	Policy needs amending as not NPPF compliant. Either ensure that LGSs meet NPPF criteria (not all do) and justify them, OR amend the policy to refer to the protection of open spaces.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	New green spaces policy is dealing with this
PP31	6	Remove reference to 'burglary' (cannot design to reduce instances of burglary). Replace with 'fear of crime'.	Noted	Add text	Policy amended to include "secure by design" in the supporting text
PP38	6	Include the appendix referred to in the actual policy.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Reference will be made. Also the change will clarify that it relates to the NP area
PP4	6	Remove 'etc' and 'as desired' as unclear meaning	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy amended
PP5	6	Consider amending the policy and combining with PP8. Consider redrafting as a landscape policy, which includes reference to settlement separation and views. At the moment, the policy is restrictive. Amend the map which shows an area to the west, but the policy refers to the south-east and west.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Amalgamate PP8 with PP22 and reclassify PP5 to a CP policy with new number and appropriate wording.

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP7	6	Define what a character building is, or amend the wording to 'heritage assets' to be consistent with NPPF. Word the policy more positively.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy reworded to reflect a change to "important heritage assets" rather than referring to "character buildings".
PP9	6	Not a planning policy - recommend removing or turning into a community policy.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy wording moved to CP5
Gen	7	Congratulations on a comprehensive and in-depth plan that sets out a clear and well considered vision for West Bergholt. MCC is supportive of all its aspirations.	Noted	None	No response required
Gen	7	Pages 28, 31, 47 and 53: Should the titles in the second columns of these SWOT tables be a continuation of 'opportunities' and 'threats' and not 'strengths' and 'weaknesses'?	Agree	Add text	Heading rows repeat formatting error will be corrected
PP22	7	Fully support this policy.	Noted	None	No response required
PP26	7	The main route to Colchester must carry a fair share of rail commuter traffic. Suggest amending to say "A rail commuter shuttle bus service for peak times should be introduced."	Noted	None	This included in the supporting documents in Appendix 2 on infrastructure
PP5	7	Fully support this policy.	Noted	None	No response required
Gen	8	No serious implications for the A12.	Noted	None	No response required
CP10	9	What would be the improved access to recreational activities, and why could this not be on the new 'areas'?	Noted	None	Access is a general term meaning improved arrangements for publicising and booking of the sports areas. This would apply across the board and would take in the new areas of recreational land should these become available
CP12	9	There seems to be a determination to have the football club away from the Lorkin Daniel Field, which has consistently been resisted by the FC on grounds to numerous too list here. A consultation should take place.	Noted	None	A consultation would take place but this isn't something for the NP policy
PP12	9	States 'minimum' of 120 dwellings. This suggests that there could be more. Change to 'maximum'?	Noted	None	Cannot do this in the context of NP requirements. Minimum levels of housing required rather than maximum.
PP12	9	p.38: I think that future developments should be confined to the designated areas. Any planning granted outside this should be taken off the total agreed, otherwise you could get 200+ dwellings which the infrastructure could not cope with.	Noted	None	Development has to be within the new settlement boundary and not confined only to the new areas. Windfall sites may still result and will be considered by a Planning Application process as happens now.
CP1	10	Additional community facilities are required over the next 15 years and therefore this probably appears reasonable. Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP10	10	Does this link to PP26?	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	Link removed from CP10
CP11	10	Does this link to PP26?	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	Link removed from CP10
CP12	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP13	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP14	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP15	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP16	10	Similar to CP15?	Noted	None	No response required

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
CP17	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP18	10	Ties in with CP2 - support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP19	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP2	10	Loneliness and isolation need to be resisted and therefore this appears reasonable. Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP20	10	Desirable target.	Noted	None	No response required
CP21	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP22	10	Ties in with CP2 - support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP23	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP24	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP25	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP26	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP27	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP3	10	Anything to raise the accessibility of community organisations with everyone should be supported. Therefore this appears reasonable. Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP4	10	Appears sensible - support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP5	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP6	10	Accept in principle but query definition of 'new areas of open space'. Needs to ensure only appropriate areas are included.	Noted	None	No response required
CP7	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP8	10	The stated aim of this policy is one of the most important for maintaining the 'feel' of this Parish. Fully endorse.	Noted	None	No response required
CP9	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP1	10	Proposal appears reasonable and has my support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP10	10	All acceptable. Suggested rewording to criteria e) 'Providing a net gain...'	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Accepted in full
PP11	10	Appears to be required - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP12	10	Seems to be a distillation of what's come out of many year's of consultations - of the need for a mix of small homes, situated near the centre of the village. Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP13	10	Appears to tie up with the Village Design Statement - therefore relevant.	Noted	None	No response required
PP14	10	This has a similar feel to it as CP8 - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP15	10	This has a similar feel to it as CP8 - support.	Noted	None	No response required

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP16	10	This has a similar feel to it as CP8 - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP17	10	This has a similar feel to it as CP8 - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP18	10	This has a similar feel to it as CP8 - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP19	10	Appears reasonable - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP2	10	Agree with the principle of the policy. I believe designated areas need to be reviewed. Are privately owned areas proposed? Is the term used correct?	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	will be changing LGS
PP20	10	Support in principle but what does 'new parking directly in front of property should be avoided' mean? What if it's in front of the 'building line' but to one side of the building itself?	Noted	Add text	The policy will be amended to ensure that it refers to poorly arranged designs for parking on developmnet sites that may result in parking on the highway etc will be challenged.
PP21	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP22	10	Vitally important so that WB does not become consumed by 'Greater Colchester'.	Noted	None	No response required
PP23	10	Support - necessary to reduce car dependence.	Noted	None	No response required
PP24	10	Strongly support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP25	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP26	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP27	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP28	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP29	10	Support - all three items important.	Noted	None	No response required
PP3	10	Agree with the principle of the policy. Map should be checked that all, and only, 'existing areas of public open space' are indicated. Is 'LGS' the correct term for areas of open space?	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Will be changing LGS
PP30	10	General support but what is 'green infrastructure network'?	Noted	None	No change to policy but need to define green infrastructure network etc elsewhere in the document.
PP31	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP32	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP33	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP34	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP35	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP36	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP37	10	Support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP38	10	Strongly support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP4	10	Reasonable and has my support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP5	10	This Parish is rightly prized for its landscape - support.	Noted	None	No response required
PP6	10	The area indicated gives a flavour of how the village would have looked in the past. Appears sensible to provide it with some protection.	Noted	None	No response required
PP8	10	The potential loss of hedgerows and trees is one of the most contentious aspects of potential development. Appears sensible.	Noted	None	No response required
PP9	10	Sensible - support.	Noted	None	No response required
CP1	11	If the facilities at Orpen and John Lamppon Halls are to be improved, it would be better if the new football pitches were sited closer to save the need for additional changing rooms, toilets etc. being erected on site B.	Noted	None	No sites available within easy walking distance of the Orpen Hall. Hence need to consider elsewhere.
PP12	11	The sites are wrong for the village and better sites exist. Reaasons given: 1. Increase in traffic and carbon levels near the school. Even with new mini roundabouts and a zebra crossing on the Colchester Road as described in PP24, there will be an increase of traffic in the wrong part of the village. All existing traffic will be slowed and stalled thus increasing carbon levels. Most of the vehicle journeys from any new site will be towards Cochester Town and this plan creates one of the longest routes. 2. By allowing a new cemetery on Site A, it will condemn the existing orchard, thus paving the way for more land to be developed. Although a lot of the remaining land will be outside the village settlement area, developers like Mersea Homes, Bovis etc. have been granted permission in other places around Colchester. The surrounding orchards extend to Great Horkesley. 3. It seems rather insensitive to have a cemetery at the end of a housing development designed for elderly and young families. 4. We would lose hedgerows and current wildlife from these spots, which would include birds of prey, deer etc. Historically, Site A was heathland which PP10 should protect. Although outside the current settlement area, Site A and its surroundings have a lot of the old village feel about it, with the White Hart Pub, old houses and heathland and should be considered as a "Character Area" much like the area shown on Map PP6.	Noted	None	NP has been formulated to look at a variety of sites and of those put forward or considered the most sustainable location is deemed to have been found. No evidence provided about carbon emissions etc being worse here than elsewhere. The cemetery site will be subjected to its own planning application to determine impact, but the full extent of the orchards is not nulified by the proposals. Design and masterplanning of the site and the cemetery will consider how best to cover this point.
PP2	11	Proposals Map: If, as you informed us at the exhibition, there will be no further development around Sites A & B, should there not be protected 'Local Green Spaces' surrounding them? This would alleviate the concerns of many residents.	Noted	None	It is our understanding that LGS cannot be stipulated to simply prevent hosing in the future.

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP22	11	Proposals Map: This large area restricts sensible development. WB cannot coalesce with Colchester as the A12 and Colchester Golf Club separate them.	Noted	None	The is a risk of coalescence without this policy despite the topography and presence of the A12.
PP24	11	The slowing down and stalling of traffic because of roundabouts will only increase carbon levels around the school. It would be better if the additional houses that need to be built in the village were at the other end as in Planning Apps 173127 and 180732.	Noted	None	See comment above regarding the choice of sites.
PP25	11	The provision of a new cemetery on map PP12 next to almshouses is rather insensitive. It would also condemn the orchard, opening it up to further development.	Noted	None	See comments above regarding the cemetery.
PP26	11	This would be better placed in the field behind Orpen Close and Firmins Close. A short walk to Orpen Hall and the facilities there that could be extended to accommodate the extra people, as described in CP1. Surely a better option than building more changing rooms etc. at a new site. However, much like the new cemetery in PP25, I would imagine the landowner would have little appetite for this unless they could cash in on some of their land being reclassified within the settlement envelope.	Noted	None	This proposal is not considered practical. New sports facilities should have their own integrated facilities such as changing rooms, car parking etc.
PP36	11	If only affordable housing is on the NDP for WB, one would assume that adequate cycle, mobility scooter storage etc. could be made on the owner's property by way of a garden shed, rather than communal storage space.	Noted	None	Communal storage of bikes etc has not been proposed. Also the new dwellings will have a good proportion of affordable housing and it is not intended that all will fit under this classification
PP5	11	Proposals Map: Sites A & B encroach on the narrowest part of the area separation. This contradicts PP21 ii and does 'affect open land which is of particular significance to the form and character of the settlement'.	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	PP5 and supporting map has been amended to make it clearer and more objective
PP8	11	The policy seems to nullify PP10.	Noted	None	No response required
PP9	11	Says it will encourage planting more hedgerows yet PP12 will ultimately reduce the existing ones.	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	PP9 has been deleted and is now contained within another policy statement.
PP12	12	I currently live in the village but just outside the envelope on Colcester Road, opposite the village school. Sites A and B are also situated along the Colchester Road and on either side of the existing houses along this stretch of the road. The new village envelope includes the new properties but excludes the few old houses and cottages that lie in between the two new sites. With the proposed new development these older properties will no longer be in a 'rural' area, but sit within the new development. I would like to suggest that the new village envelope includes the properties that lie between Site A and B.	Noted	None	It is not the intention of the NP to provide more than 120 homes and by drawing in other properties with the new settlement boundary there is a possibility of unintended development areas being created. The village settlement boundary has some anomalies but has grown over time and it is not the intention to straighten up or make the boundary neater as it would encourage a lot of speculative and opportunist development.
General	13	NEEB Holdings Ltd has submitted two applications - 180733 and 180732 - for residential development to CBC. The schemes respond to the community needs identified in the 2013 Household Survey. 180733 has now gone before Planning Committee with a recommendation for approval. 180732 was refused in June 2018 and NEEB Holdings are preparing to appeal	Noted	None	The Community and the Borough Council has considered these sites and rejected these.

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP12	13	<p>Agree that the 120 minimum dwellings figure is correct. But disagree with and objects to the proposed allocations at Sites A & B. This approach will mean that all new development is located in one area and on only two sites. It disregards other equally suitable or possibly more suitable sites. Does not represent best approach because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overlooks the deliverability risks associated with a limited number of options and overlooks the benefits of development on other sites; 2. The fact that both sites are under multiple ownership presents a deliverability risk; 3. The NP should look to allocate other sites or areas for growth in WB to avoid the deliverability issues caused by reliance on too few sites; 4. Allocating additional sites ensure that a suitable supply of housing can be maintained should one site run into delays and deliverability issues. <p>The response then goes on to list the benefits of the two sites (180733 and 180732) in terms of delivering NP objectives.</p> <p>Therefore the Plan should allocate not only Sites A & B, but also sites 180733 and 180732 should be the preferred option.</p>	Noted	Add text	The sites are in the ownership of parties which have indicated their commitment to deliver housing and this is evidenced in the supporting documents in Appendix 2.
PP2	13	<p>states that Map PP2 shows areas that are designated as 'LGS' in the parish. We support aspirations to provide new areas of Local Green Space and we can help to do this on land identified along the north of Colchester Road that belong to us.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss the option of providing additional areas of open space for benefit and enjoyment of local residents on land not identified on the map - as illustrated into the two planning apps. These could link with open space at Lorkin Way and form a 'green ribbon' around the north east of the village. This would then link with the green corridor along Colchester Road identified in the Plan for protection, providing an effective wildlife corridor and a visual buffer to separate the village from the surrounding countryside.</p>	Noted	None	The Community and the Borough Council has considered these sites and rejected these.
PP22	13	<p>We object to this.</p> <p>No information on what 'coalescence' constitutes is given nor is there any criteria provided by which development proposals in this geographic area would be measured. This is therefore a difficult policy to interpret and comply with without further evidence and explanation.</p> <p>There is already development further east than this area, and no reason why carefully site, planned and designed new development should give rise to visual coalescence with Colchester, particularly if adjacent to the immediate village envelope. Where is the evidence for this not being the case?</p> <p>The east area would not present a risk of visual coalescence - due to the topological differences, visual barriers of the A12, Colchester Golf Club and two significant woodland blocks. In fact a well-designed, landscape led scheme could improve visual issues by replacing the existing 'open edge' development on the eastern side of the village with carefully landscaped new development which could provide a clearly defined edge to the village and highly effective natural screening.</p> <p>Armoury Road (180733) would have not impact on coalescence with Colchester and does not contribute to the landscape character and quality of the surrounding area - confirmed by CBC Landscape officer comments on the recent planning application. Land here could provide a logical 'infill' housing development opportunity.</p> <p>Land at Colchester Road (180732) - the Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal found that the separation and distinctiveness of the two settlements would not be significantly affected by the application scheme</p>	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	The Policy, supporting text and map has been changed to make the matter of coalescence more objective.

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP24	13	Support aspirations to calm traffic within the village, and improve accessibility, subject to this being achievable. Re 180732, it's been demonstrated that removal of the Maltings Park right turn lane (as part of access solution) would change the character of the road and influence driver behaviour - resulting in slower speeds. Highways Agency were consulted and have agreed that this solution would be acceptable.	Noted	None	
PP35	13	Support.	Noted	None	No
PP37	13	Support. Would like to work with community to see how this could be achieved in their sites.	Noted	None	No response required
PP38	13	Support. Provides details about how the two NEED Holding sites could do this.	Noted	None	No response required
PP4	13	We recognise importance of providing community facilities and open space - would be happy to discuss possibility of providing new areas in their app land. Also new community facilities and or space. (e.g. as set out in 180732).	Noted	None	
PP5	13	This Area of Separation includes whole of the north and west of the parish (not the south and west as suggested in the text). It includes the two sites proposed for allocation for residential. The Plan should clarify whether development at sites A & B will have an adverse affect on the Area of Separation and would adversely affect its key landscape and visual characteristics.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	PP5 and supporting map has been amended to make it clearer and more objective
CP10	14	What is meant by 'increasingly managed' and how might this be achieved? The policy is imprecise and may be better set out as a position statement in supporting text. Any projects that have been identified that would deliver managed improvements to the fields should be included here.	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	This has been made clearer in the policy and supporting text. The management by the P C is to be increased to improve the use of the land, e.g. formal agreements to ensure such is reinstated by users after an event. Also wording to change to "Actively" managed rather than "increasingly"
CP11	14	What is meant by 'increasingly managed' and how might this be achieved? The policy is imprecise and may be better set out as a position statement in supporting text. Any projects that have been identified that would deliver managed improvements to the fields should be included here.	Noted	Add text	This has been made clearer in the policy and supporting text. The management by the P C is to be increased to improve the use of the land, e.g. formal agreements to ensure such is reinstated by users after an event. Also wording to change to "Actively" managed rather than "increasingly"
CP8	14	Views: Requires more evidence as is too subjective at the moment.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy and text to be changed
Gen	14	3.2.6: Without an up-to-date Local Plan, the WB Plan needs to take a flexible approach to setting housing numbers. The Plan does not meet basic conditions (a), (d), (e) and (f) or EU obligations. Site 173127 should be included in the NP, as it cannot see any evidence to not do so.	Noted	Add text	The supporting text has been amended to show how the basic condition statements have been met. In addition the NP and supporting documents in Appendix 2 show clearly how sites have been evaluated and where site area 173127 sits in this respect.
PP10	14	Biodiversity: Refers to para 113 of NPPF and the criteria in this. The NDP, as currently drafted, does not fully align with the NPPF. It fails to make a distinction and recognise that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken for national and local designated sites and their settings. Revisit this policy and ensure it is consistent with the NPPF.	Consider	Amend policy or include new policy	AMEND to say but protection of sites is to be commensurate with their status, importance and their contribution to the ecology of the site

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP13	14	High quality design: Agree that design is important, but think that this policy is too overly prescriptive and overly aesthetic requirements could impact on viability of schemes. Regard should be given to para 60 of the NPPF.	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	ADD policy to say use of VDS seeks to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness
PP15	14	Would be better described as a community aspiration.	Noted	None	Disagree policy requirement is considered essential as a planning matter
PP16	14	Would be better described as a community aspiration.	Noted	None	Disagree policy requirement is considered essential as a planning matter
PP17	14	Would be better described as a community aspiration.	Noted	None	Disagree policy requirement is considered essential as a planning matter
PP18	14	Would be better described as a community aspiration.	Noted	None	Disagree policy requirement is considered essential as a planning matter
PP19	14	Would be better described as a community aspiration.	Noted	None	Disagree policy requirement is considered essential as a planning matter
PP2	14	Local Green Spaces: We cannot see any evidence to support this policy.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	The policy and supporting text has been clarified, expanded and the map and site listings changed.
PP20	14	Would be better described as a community aspiration.	Noted	None	Disagree policy requirement is considered essential as a planning matter
PP22	14	Policy and Map: Amend wording from 'Development will not be permitted...' to 'Development will not be supported..' This is a strategic policy and not for the NDP. Would result in a blanket restriction on development to the east of WB - see para 074 of PPG. No evidence to support this policy. Gladman have a land interest here - refer to the Landscape Officer, who raises no concerns about coalescence. Do not consider this policy meets the basic conditions and should be deleted.	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Agree that wording reflecting supported rather than permitted, but disagree with other comments. Changes are however proposed around the coalescence text and supporting mapping.
PP24	14	Road improvements: Have you consulted with Highway Authority? The policy should be amended to remove the need for development to carry out works that may be unnecessary or indeed not supported by the authority.	Noted	None	Highway Authority has not raised any issues with this.
PP5	14	Area of Separation: This is a strategic policy beyond the remit of NDP. Would create a blanket restriction on development to the west of WB, giving effectively Green Belt equivalent protection. Refers to this being counter to PPG 074. No evidence provided for this policy. Refers to PPG stating that policies should not restrict housing development in settlements or prevent other settlements from expanding. Does not comply with basic conditions (a), (d) and (e).	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	PP5 has been amended and explanatory text provided in support of this.
PP7	14	Historic buildings: The Plan should refer to Paras 133 and 134 of NPPF re designated assets and 135 re non-designated assets.	Consider	Amend policy or include new policy	See CBC suggestion and look to add text changes; 2012 NPPF
SEA/HRA	14	2.3.5: of response: we are unable to establish if CBC have screened for these and the outcome. - If required, have asked for a further Reg 14. (notes the HRA concern about collective mitigation)	Noted	Add text	Refer to screening opinions in supporting documents in Appendix 2

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP12	15	<p>A 12m wide strip of land parallel to the Colchester Road does seem excessive unless it is the distance from the road. Most of the Site A and Site B land which borders the Colchester Road has a tarmac pavement flanked with a hawthorn hedge. I would like to see the hedge retained with a green (tree lined) area between the hedge and the houses about 10m wide.</p> <p>Suggested text: A 12m (from the roadway) strip of land.</p>	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy amended to read "12m strip of land parallel to the highway boundary of Colchester Road". Make sure map notation clear.
PP2	15	<p>On Map PP2 displaying 'Proposed areas of green space', a strip of land beside Manor Drive is marked as a LGS to be designated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This land (excluding the proposed 12m strip of green space parallel to the Colchester Road) is currently farmed and the intention is to continue to do so. 2. Whilst I have no intention of building on this land, as I see the strip protecting the ambiance of Manor Drive and houses along it, I am opposed to it being designated as a LGS as the public will not be able to access it and I would prefer it if no presumptive right for public access to the strip/field was designated it as a LGS which PP3 implies to be a public open space. <p>Map PP2 - the hedge on eastern (Colchester) side of my field is marked as a proposed LGS. I was told at the exhibition that this was a mistake. In order to provide just one route of access to Site B of PP12, it will be necessary to cross through this hedge and as there will need to be some give and take between the two landowners involved on that site, it would be much better if the hedge (which will hardly be a 'green space') were not designated as such.</p> <p>Map PP2: the area of my land adjacent to the cricket pitch has been pencilled in as open space in perpetuity. I didn't wish the land to be built on so that it formed a buffer zone beside the cricket pitch hopefully protecting the Cricket Club from any issues arising should someone give the ball a good thump in that direction. There have been reports of clubs closed down for balls landing on people's property (something to consider in relation to that area of site B which is closest to the cricket pitch). Main points here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The land is currently farmed and the intention is to continue to do so. ii. The public will not be able to access the land and I would prefer it if no presumptive right for public access to the field was created by designating it as open green space. iii. Should the cricket club terminate their lease (which is highly unlikely) then, providing suitable access is in place it would seem sensible to allow development on that area of land - it was only on my request (for the reason above) that it wasn't included in Site B for housing development in the current scheme. <p>As such I would like the area to remain undesignated as per the plan Map PP2.</p>	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	This area has been removed from the LGS list of designated sites.

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP3	15	<p>On the Map PP3 displaying existing areas of green space, the cricket pitch field is not marked as an existing LGS yet on Map PP2, it is. Actually it is part of our farm and I can suggest the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not and has never been a designated green space. 2. It is not public land; it is leased by the EB Cricket Club and there is no right, presumed or otherwise, of public access to this land; 3. The cricket club does suffer from dogs being walked on the land and owners not picking up their dog's faeces; 4. should the cricket club terminate their lease then I would want to revert the land to agricultural use; 5. There should be no obligation for the cricket club or myself, should the cricket club vacate the property, to have to maintain it as an open green space as there is no public access anyway. <p>There is insufficient justification for this being designated as a LGS which PP3 refers to as being existing areas of public open space. Should the cricket club no longer want the land the public will not be able to access it and I would prefer it if no presumptive right for public access to the field was created by designating it as a LGS - which would be implied by PP3.</p>	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	The LGS policy, supporting text and maps have been substantially amended removing this site from the LGS listings.
Gen	16	<p>Hopkins Homes has raised potential to identify a wider site for development to the rear of Site B. It remains interested in discussing this proposal and it could have wider community benefits that would help to deliver PP38. The plan should not seek to prohibit growth here. Details provided of the benefits of their proposal.</p>	Noted	None	This is outside the scope of the NP period.
PP1	16	<p>This policy requires all development to demonstrate an enhancement to the quality of life and wellbeing of the local community. Unclear how this is to be measured or the relevant justification for a future development to improve on an existing situation. NPPG Para 041 - these requirements are not met by the current policy wording.</p> <p>Suggested amendment: Replace first half of the first sentence to read: "All development must ensure that the proposal does not give rise to adverse impacts on the quality of life and wellbeing of the local community as a whole and provide enhancements wherever possible..."</p>	Noted	None	A positive outlook on wellbeing is expected to be demonstrated not merely a nil detriment approach.
PP12	16	<p>Part of site B here is a site that Hopkins Homes has an interest in. The policy is detailed and unacceptably prescriptive and there are elements of this that will influence the delivery of Site B and you are therefore recommended to consider amendments. Concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density - policy sets max at 20 dph to generate (across Sites A and B) a maximum development capacity of 120 units. This conflicts with the statement to provide a <u>minimum</u> of 120 dwellings. There can be no conflict on this matter in the Plan. Suggested amendment- Delete density requirement and replace with "As a general rule, the preferred density for the new development will be up to 30 dwellings per hectare. The acceptability of the density of individual schemes will be determined having regard to the quality of the design, the character of the area and the housing needs to be provided by the development." 2. Roadway verges - requiring all principal roads to incorporate a minimum 1m wide green verge to each side is a detailed design element that should not be included in the policy. Rather it should be left to consideration of individual schemes. This will also ensure that updated guidance on the need for such verges can be taken into account during the lifetime of the Plan. Suggested amendment - Amend reference to verges as "Principal roads will be expected to be designed to ensure that they are appropriate to the character of the area and the development site as well as provide appropriate space for relevant services to serve both the site and the wider area, as may be required." 3. Level of growth - in general, the NP is not planning for necessary housing growth and may limit options for achieving growth in the future. Suggested amendment - The Plan should be more specific about the number of homes to be delivered on the sites in accord with previous discussions (attachment 2 provided). Consideration should be given to identifying the remainder of the Hopkins Homes site a Reserve Site should further housing land be needed during the plan period and beyond. 	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	This is partially agreed and a change of density to a range ie 20-25 per hectare on average has been stipulated. Remove no of hectares from policy. Don't agree with verge comment. Don't agree with future growth comment.

Section / Policy	Resp Ref (Tab 2)	Feedback	Forum Response	Suggested amendment to Plan	Detail of response
PP24	16	<p>Inappropriate level of detail here for a planning policy, especially given the absence of any detailed proposals to test and demonstrate the requirements listed. Also, the Plan is intended to cover the period up to 2033 and it is reasonable to assume that highways requirements will change during that time.</p> <p>It is noted that the detailed requirements are expected to be funded by the allocated sites despite the fact that some of the requirements appear to be required to address existing issues. This is an inappropriate requirement that will undermine the deliverability of these sites.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the detailed highway measures (within the adopted public highway) are necessary, safe or acceptable to the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>Suggested amendment: Delete the second sentence in its entirety and amend the third sentence by adding "where appropriate"</p>	noted	none	Not accepted. This is a specific requirement to show what is required to promote a safe highway environment, provide adequate vehicular access and allow the developments to be built in a way that promotes walking and cycling as the first choice for short local journeys.
PP26	16	<p>Requiring Site B to deliver sports facilities adjacent to the cricket pitch is an onerous requirement that exceeds any requirements generated by residential element of this site allocation. The expense of this will impact on the deliverability of the site, such that it will be undeliverable. Previous discussions between Hopkins Homes and the NP team have made it clear that the provision of such facilities could not be financed by such a modest development and would need to be integrated as part of a wider scheme on neighbouring land that may come forward in the future under a review of the Plan. It is inappropriate to reserve significant areas of land for Public Open Space/Recreational Use where those areas are also demonstrably and evidentially suitable for residential development as indicated on Local Plan Policy map SS15. The LP map does not identify public open space in this location.</p> <p>Suggested amendment: This policy should seek to ensure that the future delivery of such facilities is not fettered by the redevelopment of this site. This is the most that could be reasonably and justifiably be sought from development of this site. Policy should be amended as: "Map PP12 identifies an aspiration for the provision of sports facilities (team ball sports) on land adjacent to the cricket club. Proposals that deliver such facilities would be supported. The redevelopment of Site B must ensure that it does not fetter the future delivery of this provision by ensuring that the potential for future access is maintained."</p>	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	Change to provision of land adjacent to the cricket club to enable provision of sports facilities. Map to show rectangles rather than specific football pitches.
PP38	16	<p>Refers to Appendix X (in relation to development demonstrating how it can contribute to a list of projects) but the document provided is not labeled as 'Appendix X' This document contains an extensive list of projects that includes such things as tree and heathland improvements, a new coffee shop and improvements to bus services. In order to maintain expectations and ensure that subsequent planning permissions comply with the CIL Regulations, it will be important to acknowledge that not all of these priorities can be delivered by new development.</p> <p>Suggested amendment: Redraft this policy to support proposals that contribute to the delivery of these projects. At the very least it should be amended to clarify what scale of development is expected to deliver such projects and that in all cases the requirement for these will be in accordance with the CIL Regulations.</p>	Noted	Amend policy or include new policy	Policy changed to PP26. Infrastructure List in supporting documents in Appendix 2. Text has been made clearer in document
PP5	16	<p>Area of Separation: describes the area covering the south east and west of the settlement, but the map shows a wider area than this including land that is allocated later on in the document. The map should be amended to more accurately reflect the description and remove land to the north of the parish from it.</p>	Agree	Amend policy or include new policy	PP5 and supporting map has been amended to make it clearer and more objective