

Your query	CVRP Comment
<p>1. On page 11 of your response form (attached) for the sub section 'key diagram' you have ticked the box to suggest you object to the key diagram. However, you also have the following text in the free text box for explaining your reasons for supporting the key diagram:  <i>"we object in so far as the key diagram identifies sites to which we object – as set out in our supporting statement and as highlighted elsewhere in this document."</i>            Could you confirm whether you would like it recorded that you (CVRP) object or support the key diagram, please.</p>	<p><i>Please record that we object to the key diagram. The inclusion of our "we object ..." comment under 'reasons for supporting' was in error.</i></p>
<p>2. You have answered "See attached statement from the Colne Valley Regional Park to support and elaborate on what we include in this this document." to some questions throughout your response form (attached). Whilst I have managed to find direct references in your accompanying supporting statement to most areas / sections of the consultation, I cannot find direct references in the accompanying supporting statement to the sections / documents listed below. Therefore, please could you confirm whether there are specific references to these sections / documents in the accompanying supporting statement, or whether the CVRP response as a whole is in reference / has given consideration to these particular sections / documents generally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on the Introduction (page 4 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on the Background &amp; Context (page 4 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on Minerals Background Study (page 114 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on Waste Background Study (page 114 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on Heritage Statement (page 117 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Study (page 117 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on Minerals Proposals Study (page 118 of the attached response form)</li> <li>• Comments on Policies Map (page 119 of the attached response form)</li> </ul>	<p><i>The reference to our 'comments' document is a general one and we do not include specific points in our document on the sections/ supporting studies/ statements you highlight. However, in the first two pages of our 'comments' document we draw out the particular context for and enduring degraded state of the part of the Colne Valley Regional Park between Horton/ Colnbrook and Poyle. This is something we consider merits attention in the various sections/ supporting studies.</i></p> <p><i>We believe that if the context for this zone had been fully understood and recorded then it would have followed that the Plan brought forward a holistic/zone-wide strategy for restoration and improvement (which any specific proposals then positively contribute to). As it is, we consider that the emerging Plan takes too narrow a view. The points above apply across the board to the sections/ documents you highlight. In the rows below we also add a few other points where appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>We consider that Figure 3 in the introduction (showing the relationship between different plans) takes too narrow a view of relevant factors.</i></p> <p><i>No additional points.</i></p> <p><i>No additional points.</i></p> <p><i>No additional points.</i></p> <p><i>No additional points.</i></p> <p><i>In our document we draw attention in para. 25 onwards (pages 6 and 7) to the completely unsatisfactory waste processing site on the edge of Horton – and yet (if we understand it correctly) the Plan proposes safeguarding it. There are flaws in the Safeguarding Study resulting in this.</i></p> <p><i>No additional points.</i></p> <p><i>Our 'comments' document is hopefully clear with regard to the policies we object to.</i></p>