



## Part B – Representation

**1. To which document does the comment relate?** *Please tick one box only.*

	Submission Plan
	Consultation Statement
	Basic Conditions Statement
	Other <i>Please specify:</i> SEA

**2. To which part of the document does the comment relate?** *Please identify the text that you are commenting on, where appropriate.*

	<i>Location of Text</i>
Whole document	X
Section	
Policy	
Page	
Appendix	

**3. Do you wish to?** *Please tick one box only.*

	Support
X	Object
	Make an observation

**4. Please use the box below to give reasons for your support/objection or make your observation.**

The SEA sustainability appraisal process is considered to be flawed.

For reasons set out in other objections, assessing that sites 10.2 and 10.3 would have a significant adverse impact because of their position on the eastern side of the village and visibility from the AONB has been overstated and runs counter to comments made by the competent authority (AONB Partnership).

With respect to site 10.2 (Middle Farm Dutch Barn) the assessment of significant adverse impact likely in relation to landscape is not supported by the comments from the AONB Partnership. Proximity to the AONB cannot be a reason for dismissing development potential.

In relation to climatic factors the site has been assessed as adverse impact likely on the basis of possible seasonal ground water and surface water flooding – despite the flood risk undertaken by the competent authority not identifying any concerns in this regard. With respect to walking to community facilities, the Highway Authority has raised no objection.

As a consequence, both factors have been assessed in an unduly critical fashion.

Similarly, with regard to site 10.3 visibility from the AONB (which the AONB Partnership has not indicated should preclude development on this site) has been overstated.

In relation to this site no specific safety concerns are identified in terms of material assets which runs counter to the assessment of site 10.2.

There is a similar inconsistency between the assessment of 10.2 and 10.3 with respect to both cultural heritage and climatic factors. Again the ranking of each site is inconsistent but also unduly critical.

With the SEA being fundamentally flawed, this document which underpins the whole plan needs to be undertaken afresh or the plan runs the risk of judicial review.

In support of this objection please find attached a report and 3 drawings 1078 PL1, 1078PL2 and 1078PL3 prepared by Richard Payne, Chartered Landscape Architect which forms part of this objection.

*Continue overleaf if necessary*

**5. Please give details of any suggested modifications in the box below.**

SEA to be undertaken again to properly take into account statutory consultee/competent expert responses and also to ensure consistency in assessment process.

The Neighbourhood Plan runs the risk of judicial review if the SEA is not re-undertaken.

*Continue overleaf if necessary*

**6. Do you wish to be notified of the District Council's decision to make or refuse to make the neighbourhood plan? Please tick one box only.**

X	Yes
	No

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018

*If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.*

*Please use this box to continue your responses to Questions 4 & 5 if necessary*