

Consultation body (if applicable)	Key Contact Name	Date Received	Form of Consultation (Email/Letter/ Feedback form)	SA Topic (where applicable)	Issues Raised	Required Action (No action / Revise Scoping Report / Action for planning policy)	If no action, document reasoning for rejecting the comments/recommendations	Responsibility for action	Summary of action taken	Timescale for resolution	Resolved? Y/N
Natural England	Alison Slade	03-May-17	Letter	Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	Thank you for your consultation, which was received by Natural England on the 03 May 2017. Natural England is satisfied with the scope for this SEA.	No Action	Satisfied with scope	n/a			
Environment Agency	Marcus Salmon	12-May-17	Email	Water & Climatic Changes	We have quickly reviewed the report and can confirm that we consider it to be appropriate, in particular with regard to the water environment and flood risk. Accordingly, we have nothing further to add to it.'	No Action	Satisfied with scope	n/a			
East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email		Amend Figure 1 to more accurately reflect the SEA and neighbourhood plan process flowchart in Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 11-033-20150209). [Page 3; Figure 1]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead			
East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email		Amend title of right-hand column to "Scoped into SEA?" [Page 9; Table 2]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Column title changed		Yes
East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email		In general, consider that it is premature to "scope out" themes until there is further consideration of the content of the Neighbourhood Plan. The SEA Regulations require the likely significant effects on such issues, and the inter-relationship between them, to be identified in the Environmental Report – it is possible that likely significant effects on these issues are identified when the Neighbourhood Plan is drafted/finalised. Therefore, suggest deleting the column titled "scoped into SA?".as it isn't needed now' [Page 9 – 16; Table 2]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead			
East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Specifically, disagree with scoping out "archaeology and cultural heritage" given what's stated in the "issues" column and the findings of the Final Screening Report, January 2017 (figure 3, page 8). [Page 11; Table 2]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Scoped in		Yes
East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email		The date of the most recent East Devon Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report is August 2015, not October 2012. [Page 17; final paragraph]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Date changed and SA checked for differences		Yes
East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email		Some of the "themes" have different titles to those previously set out in tables 1 and 2. For consistency, suggest using the same titles (or delete this column). [Page 18 – 20; Table 3]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Refers to population and health. They are combined in table 2 but are seperated in table 3. Not sure whether to keep		

East Devon District Council	Claire Rodway	24-May-17	Email		Add objectives relating to the issues that have been scoped out (see comment relating to Table 2 above). [Page 18 – 20; Table 3]	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead			
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	It is very helpful to have information on why East Devon District Council (EDDC) considered that an SEA would be required. We note that it is not the Plan's intention to allocate sites for development but that nonetheless the Council considered, inter alia, that as development will still be promoted the "likelihood of impact on historic assets is increased"	No Action		n/a			
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	It is true that policies for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment in the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan and possibly in the neighbourhood plan itself should in theory be able to preclude impacts occurring to heritage assets which are harmful in nature. But in that EDDC has identified that proposed development areas in the neighbourhood plan area are not suitable for development for various reasons it is also possible that even a modest increase in development could have an adverse impact on the individual and collective setting of designated heritage assets.	No Action		n/a			Yes
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Ensure that there is sufficient understanding of the role that these assets play in defining the special and locally distinctive qualities of the plan area as evidence to underpin the suitability and deliverability of the in-principle development aspirations that the community might promote. This would be consistent with the key message in Table 1 on the PPP review to respect, maintain and strengthen local character and distinctiveness (p6).	No Action		n/a			Yes
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	There do not appear to be Conservation Areas in the Plan area which could be a source of appropriate evidence in this respect but this is not to say that the location and distribution of heritage assets does not confer a unique and distinctive character to the area which it is desirable to recognise and protect. Indeed, retaining the hamlets' individuality is a stated objective of the Plan (p4).	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Heritage assets contribute a unique and distinctive character of the area which needs to be protected.		Yes
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Given all this, and taking account of the intention to ensure that landscape and settlement setting will remain a focus of SEA attention, it may be difficult to sustain a rationale for scoping out the historic environment from further stages of the SEA process. EDDC may also have a view on this issue.	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Scope in		Yes

Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	In terms of baseline data to draw upon and define, Table 2 sets out the heritage characteristics of the area. Our records indicate that the area contains 1 Grade I, 3 Grade II* and 63 Grade II Listed Buildings, and 2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Membury Castle remains on the national Heritage At Risk Register. I am not sure what other heritage issues might exist in the area but the duty to protect extends to all designated heritage assets - not just Listed Buildings. Additional activity arising from development, such as traffic for example, may be a legitimate issue in terms of impacting on the tranquility of an area if this contributes to its character and the setting(s) of its heritage assets.	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Data has been checked and added. Heriatge objectives from SA have now been included.		Yes
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	It may be appropriate to expand the Built Heritage and Landscape content of Table 3 (p19) to embrace settlement character and the settings of designated heritage assets, especially where they play a role in defining it.	Revise Scoping Report		ClearLead	Further information has been added to the table.		Yes
Historic England	David Stuart	09/06/2017	Email	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	We would also suggest including the NPPF as a source document for Archaeological and Cultural Heritage in Table 4 of Attachment A. This is included in other tables in this attachment so its relevance is already acknowledged and its inclusion would therefore be consistent.	No Action	Already included in Table 4	n/a			Yes