

Summary of Regulation 27 Representations

During the Regulation 27 process, the Council received 158 representations, of which 26 stated that they did not object to the document and considered it sound and 132 which considered the document not to be sound.

The main reasons for which respondents said the document was not sound are:

- The scoring of the proposed allocated sites was inconsistent with similar sites elsewhere in the district which were discounted and scores that have been changed during the various stages;
- The methodology of selecting the sites was flawed;
- Site specific issues regarding the sites which render their allocation unsound;
- The sites allocations are contrary to national policy because they are not well placed to access local services;
- Inflexibility due to the lack of reserve sites;
- Criticisms over the nature of previous consultations;
- Concern raised that the development control policy was overly prescriptive;
- The wording in the development control policy regarding impact on local residents has been changed from the wording agreed in the Regulation 25 consultation earlier this year which read: "There is no more than a minimal effect on visual and residential amenities of nearby dwellings and land" to "Any effect on visual and residential amenities of nearby dwellings and land could be mitigated at acceptable cost" which was from a previous, withdrawn document.

The full list of representations and the responses to them can be seen in the representations document.