

Ref No.	Consultation body (if applicable)	Key Contact Name	Date Received	Form of Consultation (Email/Letter/Feedback)	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	Resolved? Y/N
R1	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	Table B1 (comparing NP, No NP and Alt Plan (ie assume LP)) SEA 1.2 surely w/o NP then as per LP NO hsg + age imbalance deterioration therefore should be sig.-ve (significant negative)	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R2	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA2.2 w/o NP there is NO support for community services therefore -ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	amended; now reflects assessment for 3.2.	Yes
R3	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 3.2 w/o significant -ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R4	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 3.3 minor -ve (eg Chicken Farm development would probably go to Axminster)	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R5	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 4.1 NP sig.+ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R6	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 4.2 No NP then no design control (eg Cott Cross Cottage) & no landscape control therefore significant -ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R7	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 5.2 grading does not reflect the comments, surely should be significant -ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Seems to have been an error in the scoring. Amended as suggested	Yes
R8	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 5.3 with no NP then there is no local building design control therefore ought to be -ve	No action	This option is the Plan with the same policies as currently but without the parts which provide a number of appropriate dwellings or where they should be development. Therefore disagree that there will be less building design control	Consultants		Yes
R9	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 5.6 Village only - -be due to flood risk down stream ie Rock hamlet	Revise Assessment		Consultants	This comment may relate to table B.2? This SEA objective relates to local character. We will look at this one again. Understand that flood damage and flood defense infrastructure (barriers etc) are having an effect on local character and there is a desire for this not to worsen.	No
R10	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 6.2 surely significant -ve (eg Chalk Pit & Castle are already declining so why would that stop?)	No action	No plan option. These are in private ownership. If there is little development as we have assumed in this option, then these assets may not be affected?			Yes

R11	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 6.3 there would be no protection for historical assets therefore could develop on or around them, surely significant -ve	No action	This option is the Plan with the same policies as currently but without the parts which provide a number of appropriate dwellings or where they should be development. We need to assume that EDDC would not allow designated / listed historic assets to be developed on or otherwise significantly negatively affected by development.			Yes
R12	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 7.2 as things have deteriorated then why will that not continue? Should be significant -ve Agree, amended	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R13	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 7.3 as above (SEA7.2)	No action	This option is the Plan with the same policies as currently but without the parts which provide a number of appropriate dwellings or where they should be development. Disagree. The environmental protection policies within the NP would still provide mitigation.			Yes
R14	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 8.1 should be neutral	No action	Disagree. We wish to capture that there could be both positive and negative effects associated with this option. They don't necessarily cancel each other out to create a neutral effect.			Yes

R15	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 1.6 a lack of suitable land close to amenities = minor -ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	do you mean that lack of available land would make this option undeliverable? Would there be any land on the outskirts of Membury? We had assumed that there might be some development possible on the edges of the village. We will look again at the assessment of this option. We discussed where the few development sites are located – two in centre of village and anything further out of village doesn't meet the EDDC criteria for accessing local facilities.	Yes
R16	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 3.7 should be neutral	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed amended	
R17	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 5.5 should be minor +ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	comment should have suggested negative and we will amend. There is a risk of negative effects from larger scale of development which this option could result in.	Yes
R18	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 5.6 neutral	No action	Neutral effect is also recorded but with uncertainty. Recommend this stays as it is.			Yes
R19	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 6.6 as this would concentrate everything within the village centre should be a minor -ve	No action	We did not assume that this option would concentrate new development within the centre of the village. Assumed there might be land available on the edges of the village to be considered in this option.			Yes
R20	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 7.5 significant -ve	Revise Assessment			agree this could be -ve with uncertainty due to loss of greenfield land. The environmental protection NP policies would help to mitigate a negative effect on biodiversity.	Yes
R21	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 8.5 significant -ve	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes
R22	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 8.7 should be neutral	Revise Assessment		Consultants	Agreed and amended	Yes

R23	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 1.2 - clarification of HP3.2. No, we were NOT intending to restrict "demonstrable needs" to be just agricultural workers but have deliberately left it open so that it may be welders, electricians, carpenters or whatever. Vicky, why should it only be agri-workers?	Revise Plan	We weren't suggesting that it should be restricted, we had just chosen this as an example of the types of workers who have jobs in the plan area but do not have homes there. We will reword the recommendation. We still think that the wording 'supporting further employment' could be made clearer. Alex will remove the word 'further' from the policy wording	Membury PC		
R24	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	SEA 4.2: Policy NE2 (Light pollution). Vicky, this is quite a hot local topic. Our dark skies are really appreciated. I can see the practicality of allowing a temporary pollution and BHAONB wanted controls over the A30 that passes through our northern boundary. The main concern was that people do NOT want street lights although that would then allow a speed restriction to be included	No action	OK, understood. We could change our recommendation to suggest including the word 'permanent' in the policy. I will talk to Jo about the need for this recommendation. We may remove it.	N/A		
R25	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	Infill Definition for HP1 and HP5. Like your suggestion and will add in "... and be physically very well related to the built form of that settlement." Layout-wise that may pose a problem for me but will work on it.	Revise Assessment		Consultants	SEA Objective 7 (biodiversity): The Definition of Infill before Policy HP1 and the wording of Policy HP5 have been amended to require new housing developments in the defined hamlets and Membury village to be "physically very well related to the built form of the village" rather than referring to existing development boundaries which have not been defined within the Plan. This change removes the uncertainty in relation to SEA Objective 7 (biodiversity).	Yes
R26	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	We will amend listed assets Appendix to include designation (but I hate you for suggesting it!)	Revise Plan		Membury PC	Updated list of heritage assets	
R27	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	We will change BHE1 to add "... including the fabric & setting of listed buildings & monuments."	Revise Assessment		Consultants	We will update the assessment accordingly	Yes
R28	Membury Parish Council	Alex Tasker	31-Jul-17	Email	I am not sure about trying to get developer funds to address the state of the Castle and Chalk Pit. Both are in private hands and I can imagine what the land-owners would say to this! I do not think we should include it.	Revise Assessment		Consultants	OK, that's fine. We will remove as it seems inappropriate to include it as a recommendation.	Yes

