

| Consultation body (if applicable) | Key Contact Name | Date Received | Form of Consultation (Email/Letter/Feedback form) | Issues Raised  | Required Action (No action / Revise Assessment / Revise Plan) | If no action, document reasoning for rejecting the comments/recommendations | Responsibility for action | Summary of action taken/ Comments   | Timescale for resolution | Resolved? Y/N |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|--|---|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|
| Historic England                  | David Stuart     | 05/10/2017    | Email   | Our focus is normally on site allocation policies of which the Plan of course has none. But in this instance we also note the very impressive suite of policies aimed at protecting and enhancing the historic character, and the extensive demonstration of what makes the area distinctive which has underpinned them.   | No Action   | Satisfied with report   | N/A                       | N/A   | N/A                      | Y             |
| Historic England                  | David Stuart     | 05/10/2017    | Email   | We are also pleased to note how the findings of the SEA process have informed policy formulation and assisted in ensuring that the Plan best achieves its historic environment objectives.   | No Action   | Satisfied with report   | N/A                       | N/A   | N/A                      | Y             |
| Historic England                  | David Stuart     | 10/05/2017    | Email   | On that basis I can also confirm that we have no comments on the SEA Report and are happy to leave the resolution of any outstanding heritage issues to the discretion of East Devon District Council as local planning authority.   | No Action   | Satisfied with report   | N/A                       | N/A   | N/A                      | Y             |
| Natural England                   | Corine Dyke      | 21/09/17      | Email   | We welcome the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) produced in support of the emerging Membury Neighbourhood Plan. The SEA informs and underpins the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan for this environmentally rich and diverse parish.<br><br>We would like to make the following comments on this pre-submission version of the Plan.   | No Action   | N/A   | N/A                       | N/A   | N/A                      | Y             |
| Natural England                   | Corine Dyke      | 21/09/17      | Email   | Policy NE1 -retaining and enhancing the natural beauty of our parish<br><br>This policy covers landscape and biodiversity. We advise that in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy NE1 should make clearer that development should in the first instance avoid adverse impacts on landscape and biodiversity. Only where is shown that adverse impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation is required to counteract or minimise those impacts. We note that reference to this is made in the supporting text but this does not have the same weight as the policy itself.  | revise plan   | N/A   | MPC                       | Policy NE1a) [p9] taken on board N.E.'s input and strengthened the policy by changing "satisfactorily mitigated" to "avoided" | N/A                      | Y             |
| Natural England                   | Corine Dyke      | 21/09/17      | Email   | Policy HP1 – Meeting new build within an evolving parish<br>We recommend that this policy specifically mentions landscape. The AONB designation is an important feature of the plan area and Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in an AONB. This policy does mention heritage but is less clear about landscape. Landscape protection and conservation should be reflected clearly in Membury Neighbourhood Plan policy.<br><br>We hope these comments are helpful. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us. | revise plan   | N/A   | MPC                       | Policy HP1 [p9] added in "not detract from the landscape" in the intro para   | N/A                      | Y             |

| Consultation body (if applicable)                              | Key Contact Name | Date Received | Form of Consultation (Email/Letter/Feedback form) | Issues Raised   | Required Action (No action / Revise Assessment / Revise Plan) | If no action, document reasoning for rejecting the comments/recommendations  | Responsibility for action | Summary of action taken/ Comments   | Timescale for resolution | Resolved? Y/N |
|--|------------------|---------------|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|
| Blackdown Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership | Lisa Turner      | 25/09/17      | Email   | <p>Thank you for the further opportunity to comment on this latest version of the Membury Neighbourhood Plan. I have confined comments to areas previously commented on.</p> <p>Natural Environment –<br/>I still think that Objective 1a misses the point. This is a key opportunity to promote the importance of the local AONB landscape as the foundation to all else, and there is more to it than planting native trees and hedges – planting schemes need to be considered as contributing to the wider landscape. This could simply be addressed by including a reference to planting in terms of strengthening or contributing to local landscape character in this objective.</p>   | No Action   | Alex Taskers's email dated 17/10.17 states that justification for not taking action is needed  | MPC                       |   | N/A                      | N             |
| Blackdown Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership | Lisa Turner      | 25/09/17      | Email   | <p>Objective 2a – It is nonsensical to exclude trunk road schemes from this objective. As I have said previously the PC, EDDC, DCC and Highways England all have a duty to have regard to conserving and enhancing natural beauty, and there is no reason to treat differently. Arguably, trunk roads have the potential to have an enormous adverse impact on tranquillity and dark skies. All that said, as I have also said previously you do not have a trunk road in your parish anyway.</p>   | revise plan   | N/A  | MPC                       | changed NE Objective 2a) by deleting “non-trunk” p6                                   | N/A                      | Y             |
| Blackdown Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership | Lisa Turner      | 25/09/17      | Email   | <p>In correspondence relating to the previous consultation in January 2017 I highlighted that in the natural environment chapter, it would reinforce the AONB purpose if the reference in the Objective, Headings and the Policy was ‘conserve’ rather than retain, i.e. ‘conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of our parish’ and this was agreed. I note that this has been addressed in Objective 1a, but not in the heading or policy.</p> <p>These points above may seem to labouring the point, but if the neighbourhood plan is truly intended to give weight to the AONB management plan then common language and key messages are important.</p>   | revise plan   | N/A  | MPC                       | changed “retain” to “conserve” in NE Objective 1a) (page 6) and in header (bottom p6) | N/A                      | Y             |
| Blackdown Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership | Lisa Turner      | 25/09/17      | Email   | <p>Housing –<br/>Taken as a whole I find that the housing policies lack clarity, contain contradictions and do not provide a clear picture for future housing growth in the parish, and hence raises concerns about the potential for unchecked sporadic, speculative new housing in the open countryside of the AONB. Whilst the intention of the parish in respect of housing is acknowledged, it is suggested that prior to submission the housing policies are looked at objectively to identify if they will deliver the desired outcomes and whether they provide necessary clarity and certainty. One particular area of concern are the ‘defined hamlets’ and the reference to a ‘developed envelope’ in the infill definition in that no envelopes appear to have been defined and that there seems to be little difference between a ‘hamlet’ and a ‘cluster’. Apart from Rock, all would appear to be some distance from the services and facilities at Membury village.</p> | No Action   | The Steering Group disagreed with BH and have used a definition of "Infill" also used in at least one other NP and LP. Knowledge of the defined hamlets makes the "envelope" obvious and puts development clearly within the control of the parish through the Parish Council. | MPC                       |   |                          | N             |

| Consultation body (if applicable) | Key Contact Name | Date Received | Form of Consultation (Email/Letter/Feedback form) | Issues Raised   | Required Action (No action / Revise Assessment / Revise Plan) | If no action, document reasoning for rejecting the comments/recommendations                   | Responsibility for action | Summary of action taken/ Comments  | Timescale for resolution | Resolved? Y/N |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------|
| Somerset County Council           | Amy Shepherd     | 21/09/17      | Email   | The Neighbourhood Plan reflects a community interest in the protection of tranquillity. References to tranquillity are associated with policies HP5 (Self-build Housing), EE2 (Conversion of Agricultural Buildings), ELC1 & ELC2 (Low Carbon Energy) and policy NE2 specifically deals with its preservation and the Neighbourhood Plan makes specific mention of 'levels and extent of noise' within this policy. The LP as such may benefit by providing a fuller description of, or reference to, the environmental aspects that both contribute to, and threaten this subjective attribute since these are not limited to noise or noise level.  | No Action   | The Plan as written provides the flexibility for the MPC to take action if and when needed.   | MPC                       |  |                          | N             |
| Somerset County Council           | Amy Shepherd     | 21/09/17      | Email   | In the view of the County Council Acoustics Specialist the requirements of policy NE2, to demonstrate that new development 'will have no adverse effect on the tranquillity of the parish through increasing levels and extent of noise' would be difficult, as none of the terms (level, extent, tranquillity) are defined. If the policy intent is to preserve the existing standards of tranquillity within the parish, in general terms, then it might be better to require noise and visual impacts from development not appear distinct or uncharacteristic within the areas that might be affected by those impacts. The research undertaken by University of Bradford's Centre for Sustainable Environments on this topic and their method of quantifying tranquillity known as TRAPT - Tranquillity Rating Prediction Tool may also be helpful when considering development proposals and impacts on areas with valued tranquillity. Further recent consideration of tranquillity is also provided in the Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 2017: Tranquillity – An Overview. | No Action?  | Alex Taskers's email dated 17/10.17 states that justification for not taking action is needed | MPC                       | MPC does not wish to change the NP as it has decided that the comments are taken beyond the intention of the plan.   |                          | Y             |
| Somerset County Council           | Amy Shepherd     | 21/09/17      | Email   | In the context of preserving or enhancing tranquillity it may be worth mentioning less obvious need to preserve natural acoustic features that contribute to tranquillity by virtue of them providing screening or masking noise, as these features can then help to extend the boundaries of tranquil space. These features are demonstrated in wooded landscapes where acoustic masking might arise from the sound of running water or the sound of wind in the trees. Similarly preserving raised banks or dense hedges along lanes and roads can help to screen traffic noise and preserve tranquillity over a greater area. The introduction of such features to individual developments can also help to improve the acoustic environment locally.  | no action?  | Alex Taskers's email dated 17/10.17 states that justification for not taking action is needed | MPC                       | The MPC Steering Group considered a change to the NP in response to this comment, by adding a requirement "to retain noise masking features within developments, such as raised banks and to encourage the introduction of such features as mitigation where an acoustic |                          | Y             |

| Consultation body (if applicable) | Key Contact Name | Date Received | Form of Consultation (Email/Letter/Feedback form) | Issues Raised  | Required Action (No action / Revise Assessment / Revise Plan) | If no action, document reasoning for rejecting the comments/recommendations                   | Responsibility for action | Summary of action taken/ Comments   | Timescale for resolution | Resolved? Y/N |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|--|---|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|
| Somerset County Council           | Amy Shepherd     | 21/09/17      | Email   | Unnecessary noise intrusion from new development or that which might arise if agricultural machinery (associated with policy EE3) is not maintained or silenced to manufactures specification can erode tranquillity. Consent to commercial and farm development might wish to encourage the use of broadband reverse alarms to avoid the distinctive noise arising from the use of bleep tone reverse warning alarms that can be audible over considerable distances. | no action?  | Alex Taskers's email dated 17/10.17 states that justification for not taking action is needed | MPC                       | The Steering Group considered adding a requirement "for consent to commercial and farm development to be dependent on conditions to use broadband reverse alarms to avoid the noise arising from the use of bleep tone reverse warning alarms".This was considered not an appropriate |                          | Y             |
|                                   |                  |               |   |  |   |   |                           |   |                          |               |