

Is this your own personal response, or are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	This is a personal response
Your full name	Michael Blanche
Your full postal address	[REDACTED]
Your full postcode	[REDACTED]
Contact email address	[REDACTED]
Main Modification 8 comments	For Policy 5 (2) (iii) this proposed change substantially changes the meaning of the previous text and appears to weaken the protections on PROWs and views therefrom. It is unclear why this needs to be changed, or why it cannot be written in the same way as 2 (ii)..
Main Modification 11 comments	Under Policy 8, 1 (c), there are five different possible impacts. After (iii) and (iv) it says "or", but does not after (i) or (ii). It is unclear which of these need to be met - is it all five resource, one, or some? If the intention is that there should be no adverse impact on any of these five resources, the text should be reworded to make this clear.
Main Modification 14 comments	In Policy 11 (1), by the removal of (b) and addition of (l) this appears to confuse the requirement to not have an adverse impact on human health or well-being, with what is a separate possible "opportunity" to enhance this. It is also unclear what "multi-functional benefits" in (l) is.
Main Modification 15 comments	Policy 12 (1) (c) has poor grammar - (iii) needs to start with "the development incorporates flood protection, flood resilience...".
Main Modification 24 comments	Policy 21 (2) does not have a clear order of evaluation. If (a) is true do the tests (b)-(e) still need to be applied? Is it really intended that there should be an "or" at the end of (d) - as it reads at the moment, it appears that a significant adverse impact on the environment and local communities is acceptable if (e) applies. This cannot be the intended meaning?
Main Modification 29 comments	Policy 28 (3) is unclear as to the order of evaluation. Is the requirement for (a)+(b) or (a)+(c), or is (c) alone sufficient? I believe the intention is the former but it is unclear at present.
Main Modification 33 comments	Again the order of evaluation is unclear. Is (a) alone sufficient? Or is the requirement (a)+(c) or (b)+(c)?