

Cranleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan

Cranleigh Parish Council response to Examiner's Clarification Note

This Note is the response by Cranleigh Parish Council (the Parish Council) to the questions raised by the Examiner in respect of the Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan (the Neighbourhood Plan). In each case, the Parish Council's response is provided in **bold text**.

This Note also include a response from Waverley Borough Council (WBC) to the matters addressed to WBC in the Examiner's Clarification Note.

The delivery of new housing

The Plan takes a positive approach to this matter in the allocation of three sites for housing purposes (Policies CRAN 1A-1C).

Please can the Parish Council advise about the nature of any existing planning permissions for housing developments on the three proposed allocated sites?

The latest position on the 3 site allocations is as follows:

- **CRAN1A: Land at rear of the former Manns store (appl. ref: WA/2022/00657) - Work has commenced on the site but there are currently no recorded completions.**
- **CRAN1B: Land at West Cranleigh Nurseries (appl. ref: WA/2022/00195) – There is record of work having commenced to implement the permission. Given that this is the final phase of development, with earlier phases ongoing, it is envisaged that the first completions will be in 2026/27 (as shown in the Waverley Borough Council 5-year housing land supply document, April 2023¹).**
- **CRAN1C: Land off Bloggs Way – No application has been submitted and there have been no pre-application discussions with Waverley Borough Council. The site is owned by Surrey County Council and they have confirmed that it is available and deliverable.**

Various representations from the development industry have commented about:

- the dated nature of Local Plan Part 1;
- the revised strategic housing requirement for the neighbourhood area in Local Plan Part 2; and
- the potential need for an early review of any made neighbourhood plan once Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted.

To what extent has the Parish Council grappled with these matters?

The Parish Council acknowledges that the Local Plan Part 1 is now more than 5 years old. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is legal requirement to review local plans at least every five years, this does not automatically render the Local Plan Part 1 out of

¹ <https://www.waverley.gov.uk/Services/Planning-and-building/Planning-strategies-and-policies/Housing-supply-and-delivery/Five-Year-Housing-Supply>

date, nor does it place any additional requirements on the Neighbourhood Plan to try to second-guess future strategic policy. Paragraph 33 of the NPPF states:

“Relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable local housing need figure has changed significantly; and they are likely to require earlier review if local housing need is expected to change significantly in the near future.” (our emphasis)

The Parish Council cannot know whether these matters will require attention by Waverley Borough Council as part of its Local Plan review. Most of those making representations to the Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan on this matter considered that, because the 5-year period for reviewing a local plan had passed, the Neighbourhood Plan must allocate an undefined number of additional houses. It is simply not appropriate or, more importantly, necessary for it to do so in order to meet the Basic Conditions. In this respect, the Parish Council has worked closely with planning officers from Waverley Borough Council to ensure that the position on housing allocations is robust. However, in the absence of evidence coming forward as part of any Local Plan review that Waverley Borough Council chooses to undertake, it would not be appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate further sites.

It is important to be clear that there is no ‘revised strategic housing requirement for the neighbourhood area in Local Plan Part 2’. Whilst the inspector for the Local Plan Part 2 examination requested up-to-date housing figures for Cranleigh, this was not for the purpose of changing the strategic housing requirement. Paragraph 31 of the Inspector’s report² on the Local Plan Part 2 states:

“In this context, the Council’s position that it is not necessary for LPP2 to identify a five-year supply is a soundly-based one, as it is only one component of the policies directed to this matter in relation to the Borough as a whole. I therefore find no inconsistency with the Framework (at paragraph 68) in these regards, insofar as the requirement for planning policies to identify a five-year supply is concerned, as this LPP2 does not contain all of the development plan policies relevant to the area. Neither is the expressed purpose of the LPP2, as set out either in the terse description given in the LDS, or in the fuller explanation set out in the Plan’s introduction, to establish a five-year supply. Furthermore, due to the modular nature of the development plan relevant to the Borough, neither is it necessary for the LPP2 to seek to meet the area’s objectively addressed needs, or its affordable housing requirement in full. Nevertheless, meeting the requirements for the settlements named above is a legitimate focus for its policies...”

This is clear that the Inspector did not consider it necessary or appropriate to amend the housing requirement for Cranleigh (or any other location) from that in Local Plan Part 1, irrespective of the position with its 5-year housing supply.

The Inspector states rightly that meeting the requirements for its settlements is a legitimate focus for the Local Plan Part 2 policies. It should be noted that the representations by Neame Sutton (on behalf of Bewley Homes) consider that progress against the requirement for Cranleigh should be tied to the updated figures requested by the Local Plan Part 2 inspector in September 2022. This showed that as at April 2022,

² <https://www.waverley.gov.uk/Portals/0/Documents/services/planning-and-building/planning-strategies-and-policies/local-plan/Local%20Plan%20Part%202%20Examination/Appendix%201%20Waverley%20LPP2%20Examination%20Report.pdf?ver=7ciUY6gCt2u9jQOZOdNckQ%3d%3d>

there was a shortfall against the 1,700-dwelling target. Yet this data has since been updated as of September 2022 by Waverley Borough Council's formal monitoring data. The figures presented as part of the Regulation 16 submission documents (entitled 'Housing numbers'³) show that, as at September 2022, the housing requirement has been met. It should be noted that since this time, there have been further completions.

The Parish Council recognises that the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to need early review. However, it is not clear why this would be necessary now that Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted (pending the outcome of the current judicial review). The relevant paragraph from the Local Plan Part 2 Inspector's report and the Parish Council's response above to the issues raised in Regulation 16 representations relating to housing delivery in Cranleigh are considered to explain why this is not considered appropriate. The expectation is that the Local Plan Part 1 review will be commenced in the near future and therefore there will be a new strategy and robust housing need figures for Cranleigh that may require an update of the Neighbourhood Plan. In this regard, the Parish Council would be open to taking forward a review of the Plan at this time (although this would be subject to agreement at a full Parish Council meeting at the appropriate time).

What is the Parish Council's views on a potential early review of the Plan in the event that it is made?

See our response above on this matter.

Policy CRAN6

On the one hand, the policy is commendably comprehensive.

On the other hand, it addresses both the natural landscape/rural character and biodiversity. Plainly there are overlaps between the various issues. Nevertheless, was this approach deliberate?

This approach was not deliberate.

Both parts A and B of the policy set out a requirement for 'enhancement'. I am minded to recommend that this approach is modified so that development proposals are required to preserve the issue concerned and enhance it where practicable. This acknowledges that in some cases enhancement will not be feasible. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

The Parish Council agrees with this proposal, although it should be noted that in clause B, proposals are 'encouraged to enhance'.

Whatever amendments may be made to the wording of Policy CRAN6, it is considered important to state that biodiversity net gain should be delivered on site where practicable.

³ <https://www.cranleigh-pc.gov.uk/UserFiles/Files/N%20Plan/22.11.09%20-%20Cranleigh%20Housing%20Numbers%20Note.pdf>

I understand the approach taken in Part C of the policy. However, how would Waverley Borough Council be able to identify which proposals would affect the setting of the Surrey Hills AONB? In addition, should the details required be proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposed development?

This issue was also recognised by Waverley Borough Council in its Regulation 16 representations. Waverley Borough Council does not propose specific alternative wording but the following is considered by the Parish Council to appropriately address the matter:

“All new development which may affect the setting of the Surrey Hills AONB will be required to submit evidence demonstrating the impact of development on the AONB. A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) may be required where it is considered necessary.”

Policy CRAN7

The ambition of the policy is clear. However, given that there is no Air Quality Management Area in the parish and that no other strategies are referenced in the supporting text, how would the policy be administered?

Could the policy be modified so that it takes on a more positive format (developments should be designed to safeguard existing air quality) rather than the submitted negative approach (the need for detailed assessment to show that current levels are not exceeded)?

The Parish Council agrees that this would be an appropriate approach. It would perhaps assist the policy if the supporting text made reference to the value of applications addressing the relevant opportunities identified in the Waverley Borough Council Clean Air Strategy 2023 and its Air Quality Action Plan 2023⁴.

Policy CRAN8

As with Policy CRAN7 the ambition of the policy is clear. However, is the first part of the policy already addressed by the Water Framework Directive and the second part in legislation applying to the storage of hazardous substances (by HSE and/or the Environment Agency)?

These points are noted and it is observed that the policy would provide more flexibility on such matters if it was worded in a positive manner. The Parish Council suggests the following wording for the policy:

“Development should seek to improve water quality where possible. Development proposals that propose to store and/or use hazardous substances should clearly demonstrate how their design will ensure that no unacceptable risks to water quality are likely to arise.”

⁴ <https://www.waverley.gov.uk/Services/Environmental-concerns/Pollution-control/Air-quality/Air-Quality-Action-Plan-and-Clean-Air-Strategy>

Policy CRAN10

The policy takes a positive approach to this important matter.

However, is criterion h now required given the recent introduction of Part S of the Building Regulations (on EV charging facilities)?

Yes, this is agreed.

Policy CRAN11

I note the comments in paragraph 6.50 of the Plan. However, is the definition of an Area of Strategic Visual Importance a strategic matter and therefore not one for a neighbourhood plan to address?

The area of the ASVI is addressed in Local Plan Part 2. The Plan was found sound by the Inspector who stated in his report that it was a non-strategic plan (paragraph 14). Therefore the issue of the boundary and the way that it is determined must also be a non-strategic matter which is therefore within the gift of a neighbourhood plan to address.

This question may concern the issue raised in the study commissioned by Gleeson Land Limited (by David Williams Landscape Consultancy, or DWLC). At paragraph 7, it cites wording by the Examiner of the previous version of the Neighbourhood Plan that was subsequently withdrawn, stating that there was no policy to support the amendment of the ASVI boundary. Notwithstanding that the Neighbourhood Plan was withdrawn, therefore the Examiner's Report is no longer a matter of public record, the reason the Examiner came to this conclusion was that, at that time, the Local Plan Part 2 had yet to reach Regulation 19 consultation stage. Now there is a Local Plan Part 2 which has passed examination and, pending the outcome of the judicial review, will be adopted. This provides the appropriate policy framework.

The relationship between Figure 29 and Figure 30 is unclear. Could the details shown on Figure 30 also be shown on Figure 29?

Yes, this is agreed.

Does the Parish Council wish to respond to the representation from Gleeson Land Limited and the details included in the work which it has commissioned on this matter?

The DWLC report states that the work by the Parish Council should have been updated following the Examiner's report on the withdrawn Neighbourhood Plan. At paragraph 13 it states, "...a robust, rigorous and objective assessment of the ASVI and new areas to be included is needed to support the change to the Cranleigh ASVI." To this the Parish Council would make three responses:

- 1. A robust, rigorous and objective assessment of the *existing* ASVI area is not required as this has already been established through the earlier local plan evidence base. It can only be the proposed amendments that are the subject of scrutiny.**

2. The ASVI Assessment, included as part of the Regulation 16 evidence base, is considered to represent a robust assessment, with its age having no bearing on this. There is no evidence in the DWLC report that provides a detailed expert (objective) alternative assessment of the proposed additions. It is therefore unclear how this is sufficient to justify the proposed additions not being included.
3. Amendments were made to other ASVI boundaries in Waverley and were included in the Local Plan Part 2. Yet none of these were supported by the level of evidence used to justify the proposed amendments to the Cranleigh ASVI. It is not clear why there is higher bar set in this instance.

Policy CRAN 12

The assessment of proposed Local Green Spaces (LGSs) is very thorough. In addition, Appendix 4.3 is very comprehensive and helpfully underpins the policy.

Within this wider context:

- is LGS genuinely local in character?
For everything other than the Cranleigh Show, the area is used almost exclusively by local residents, Moreover, its use by local people has increased since Covid. One of the main reasons is that a lot of the countryside surrounding Cranleigh is not easily accessible for most people, due to its hilly, winding nature. Therefore, local residents have to travel a long way for more accessible informal leisure space, often well outside the village. The Showground is the only relatively flat space which is accessible for most people on the eastern side of the village. Also, there is no parking so most users walk to the area. Given how far it is for people from outside Cranleigh to travel to, the lack of parking is a deterrent and bicycles are not permitted. For these reasons it is considered that it is local in character.
- LGS O is clearly iconic. However, is it genuinely local in character? In addition, is it already adequately protected by its designation as common land and its management by Waverley Borough Council?
For many of the same reasons that the Showground is local in character, the Common is considered local in character. The difference is in the way the space is used, with the Common less a space for walking and more for formal and informal leisure activities. The formal activities, such as the annual bonfire celebration are predominantly aimed at local people. The informal activities such as picnicking, etc, tend to mainly attract local people as it is a long way for non-residents to travel in order to undertake such activities.
Whilst the common land designation affords certain protections, it does not address all matters satisfactorily. As the body that is the first port of call to protect the rights of the community, the Parish Council's experience is that legislation relating to common land is very complex and hard to uphold. Specifically there are increasing areas of the Common that are being infringed on, either by seeking to park on or drive over them. This has been permitted through easements granted over many years but attempts to add further spaces that are the subject of such easements has increase in recent years. There is a

steady erosion of the Common as a space for the community, therefore it is considered that a local green space designation is justified.

Policy CRAN13

The purpose of the policy is clear.

However, is Part A reasonable within the broader national context of making the best use of urban land?

Paragraph 119 of the NPPF states:

“Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.” (my emphasis)

The NPPF is therefore clear that making effective use of land brings in wider considerations that just density of development. Even so, paragraph 124d states:

“Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account... the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting(including residential gardens)...”

In Cranleigh, one of the main considerations is maintaining the local character of what is a rural village. In this context, larger gardens are part of that character; this is distinct from the setting of more urban locations such as Guildford which have much smaller or communal gardens. If this approach was taken in Cranleigh then it would have the effect of making the village look and feel more like a large town.

The Examiner will be aware that the same policy requirement was included in the Witley Neighbourhood Plan (Policy ND7: Safeguarding Residential Amenity) which was considered to meet the Basic Conditions and has since been made. The rural character and context of Witley is considered to not be dissimilar to that of Cranleigh.

Policy CRAN15

Part A takes a positive approach to the sustainability of new housing. However, should it acknowledge that its ambitions may not always be practicable?

Yes, this is acknowledged and appropriate wording should be added to provide the necessary flexibility. If it helps, then the supporting text could make reference to the Surrey County Council Healthy Streets policy, which is part of their design codes⁵.

Part D is a process matter rather than a land use policy. As such, I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

This is acknowledged and accepted.

⁵ <https://healthystreets.surreycc.gov.uk/>

Policy CRAN 16

Has the purpose of Part B of the policy now been overtaken by the introduction of Part S of the Building Regulations?

Yes, this is agreed.

Policy CRAN17

Part B is a process matter rather than a land use policy. As such I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

This is acknowledged and accepted.

Matters for Waverley Borough Council

I would find it helpful if Waverley Borough Council would provide me with:

- an update on the judicial review of Local Plan Part 2 and its potential impact on the submitted neighbourhood plan;

WBC Response:

The challenge is essentially concerned with the Inspector's consideration of the scope of LPP2 and housing supply matters. In summary, the three grounds of challenge are:

- that the Inspector unlawfully failed to consider whether it was sound to restrict the scope of LPP2 as a 'daughter document' to LPP1.***
- that, even if the Inspector was not required to consider the scope of LPP2, his approach to the examination of LPP2 was unlawful because he misinterpreted LPP1. In particular, it is contended that he unlawfully failed to consider and interrogate (1) the effect of LPP2 on the delivery of the housing requirement in LPP1 and/or (2) the maintenance of a 5YHLS after the adoption of LPP2.***
- that the Inspector's conclusion that there was a reasonable prospect of varying or discharging a restrictive covenant relating to the allocated housing site at Land Opposite Milford Golf Course was irrational.***

The Council's view is that the challenge should not affect the examination of the Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan ("CNP") for the following reasons:

- ***The CNP addresses the housing requirement for Cranleigh identified in Policy ALH1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1). The Council's development plan has been prepared on a modular basis and the matters raised in this challenge should therefore be considered outside the scope of the examination of CNP.***
- ***LPP2 is an adopted part of the statutory development plan and will remain so unless the High Court decides otherwise (or until it is replaced by a new Local Plan). The Secretary of State and the Council are strongly resisting the legal challenge and, in any event, think it is unlikely to succeed.***
- ***LPP2 only allocates sites in Witley (including Milford) and Haslemere/Hindhead. Even if the legal challenge were to succeed, which the***

Council thinks is unlikely, we would strongly argue that sites elsewhere in the Borough should not be considered as part of any partial re-examination of the plan. This would have to be dealt with through a new Local Plan, which will take a number of years to complete. In the meantime, it would be wrong to hold up the allocation and delivery of the sites allocated in the CNP.

The High Court hearing was on 7 and 8 November 2023. A judgement may be issued by the end of the year but that is in the hands of the Court.

- an update on the planning appeal referenced in the Gleeson representation.

WBC Response:

An Outline Application for 162 dwellings and associated works at Land East of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh is currently the subject of a Planning Inquiry which opened on 21 November 2023 and is anticipated to run for 9 days (Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/23/3326412). Details of the Inquiry schedule and the appeal documents can be viewed on the Council's website: [Waverley Borough Council - Land East of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh](#)

Representations

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

The Parish Council considers that it would not help the examination to seek to rebut every point made in the representations. Our responses below therefore address matters which the Parish Council considers are significant and where a response may assist the Examiner. Matters related to the overall housing requirement for Cranleigh, established in Waverley Local Plan Part 1, have been address earlier in our response. A number of the matters raised by those bodies listed below concern the housing requirement and therefore the Parish Council does not consider it necessary to repeat its responses here. As we hope the Examiner is aware, the Parish Council considers that the requirement for a minimum of 1,700 dwellings in Cranleigh over the plan period is established and, with the site allocations (CRAN1A-CRAN1C) will be met and exceeded over the remainder of the plan period. An early review of the Neighbourhood Plan may be necessary, pending any review of the Local Plan and a new housing requirement for Cranleigh being established.

I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations from:

- Gleeson Land Limited
 - **CRAN13E: Object to requirement for hedging to be provided at rear boundaries in all cases. This point is acknowledged although the proposed amendment is considered to be overly flexible. It is considered particularly important that boundaries facing open countryside are not fenced or walled and the Parish Council has not encountered circumstances where such provision would be inappropriate. Therefore it is recommended that the wording be amended to read,
“Provide hedging consisting of indigenous species at the rear boundary of all dwellings (where appropriate) and in particular where the boundary is adjacent to open countryside.”**

- **CRAN14C: Object to requirement to retain existing drainage ditches and culverts in all circumstances. This point is acknowledged although the proposed amendment is being sought in order to provide a level of flexibility that is unnecessary. Clearly if an applicant can demonstrate that something as fundamental to a development as existing drainage infrastructure cannot be retained, then this will not prevent development and it is not necessary for a policy to facilitate this.**
- **Royalton Group**
 - **Matters relating to the proposed local green space designation at Cranleigh Common have been addressed in response to the Examiner's question regarding Policy CRAN12.**
 - **Regarding the merits of site put forward at Ruffold Farm, the Parish Council would point the Examiner to the refusal of outline planning permission in December 2018 for 20 dwellings on a large part of the same site (appl. ref. WA/2018/1636). The reasons for refusal were that the proposed development would result in harm to rural landscape features of merit, to the landscape character of the area and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In addition, it had not been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.**
- **Bewley Homes Limited;**
 - **Sustainability Appraisal: Object to consideration that 10% uplift in housing requirement will have significant negative effects on landscape. The Parish Council considers that its assessment is sound – the assessment of the landscape capacity as 'medium' does not mean that major development can simply come forward. No evidence has been presented to demonstrate the impact of the development of the site in question. The Parish Council would also note that the objection to the SA disregards the other objectives against which the 10% uplift scenario was considered to have potential negative effects, i.e. 1/ preserve and enhance natural beauty, 2/ protect and enhance biodiversity, 8/ improve safety and sustainability of movement and 11/ reduce contribution to climate change. When compared with the other options which only had a single possible negative effect, the 10% uplift scenario was not considered to represent a reasonable alternative.**
- **Land and Partners Limited**
 - **Previous allocations: Object to the removal of the 3 greenfield sites previously allocated in the 2021 Regulation 14 version of the plan. It is not considered necessary to retain greenfield allocations that were in a previous version of the plan. Whilst these 3 allocations were proposed to total 37 dwellings, which would represent less than the 10% uplift tested in the Sustainability Appraisal, that assessment showed that such a scenario would have a number of negative effects. Allocation of a number of sites that would contribute towards such effects is not considered to be justified.**
 - **Land off Amlets Place: The site should be allocated because it has a resolution to grant (ref. WA/2021/01837). Whilst there is a resolution to grant, as at mid-November 2023, the site does not have the benefit of planning permission. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Bloggs Way allocation also does not have planning permission, it is a brownfield site within the existing settlement**

boundary therefore the principle of development is established. It is not appropriate or necessary to allocate every single site that has the benefit of planning permission at the time of examination.

- **Self-build plots: Object to removal of proposed allocation of land east of Longfields on the basis that there is a shortfall in the provision of self-build plots which were proposed for the site. The objection acknowledges that the root of the problem lies with the Local Plan but then states that, “...the Cranleigh NP will need to deal with this need otherwise it risks failing to meet the basic conditions.”** The objection then states that this is because the Neighbourhood Plan would not be in general conformity with the development plan and that the NPPG requires the making of a neighbourhood plan to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The Parish Council considers that the Local Plan Part 1 – which the Neighbourhood Plan has to be in general conformity with – has not placed a requirement on the Neighbourhood Plan to provide self-build plots, let alone a minimum number. Also, given that the Neighbourhood Plan is not under obligation to cover any specific planning matter (unlike a local plan), the test of whether it fails to achieve sustainable development cannot be because it doesn’t address a particular matter in policy. It can only be because any matter it does consider fails to achieve sustainable development.
- **Cranleigh and South Eastern Agricultural Society**
 - **The Parish Council has taken on board the comments of the previous examiner and made amendments accordingly. However it is the opinion of the Parish Council that the Showground is an appropriate site to apply for the status of LGS – see Appendix 4.3 and comments made above regarding Policy CRAN12.**
 - **The Cranleigh Show has already appointed a secretary for the Show next year and this meets with the Cranleigh and South Eastern Agricultural Society’s objectives, “To promote, maintain, improve and advance agriculture, to promote good farming and the advancement of the breeding and rearing of livestock, poultry and horses and to foster and maintain the education of the public and its interest and awareness in agricultural industry generally.”**
 - **The current Society took over from the Cranleigh and West Surrey Farming Club, which was founded in 1946 in the aftermath of the Second World War and has maintained the same objectives to this day.**
 - **Local people have used this area for recreation for over 32 years, it is only over approximately the past 4 years that there has been a sign indicating the direction of the footpath. The footpath is not demarcated with any fencing or vegetation therefore visitors have, over many years, enjoyed broad access to the site with views to the Surrey Hills beyond. Walking is particularly important as a recreational activity.**
 - **Information relating to biodiversity on the site has been taken from DEFRA’s Magic database (<https://magic.defra.gov.uk/>) which is updated once a month. The information provided is available to access.**

The Borough Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies and the supporting text in the Plan. Does the Parish Council have any comments on the suggested revisions?

The table below provides the Parish Council’s response to each of the points raised by Waverley Borough Council.

Para/policy no.	Parish Council response
2.7	Do not agree that the objectives should be amended. No change.
4.14	Amend typo
CRAN1B	Agree suggested wording amendment
CRAN2D	Agree suggested wording amendment
CRAN2E	Agree suggested wording amendment
CRAN2F	The policy 'encourages' such provision. It is therefore not an absolute policy requirement that needs viability testing.
CRAN3A	'Preserve or enhance' gives a choice which seems strange (if you choose to 'enhance' then it makes it sound like it is not necessary to 'preserve'). The Parish Council accepts the point however and proposes the following wording: 'Preserve and, where possible, enhance'.
CRAN3B.d.	As above, which therefore makes more sense regarding views (i.e. the test would be solely to 'preserve')
CRAN4 intro text	Agree removal of text
CRAN4	Agree – clause A could be deleted
CRAN6A	'Preserve or enhance' gives a choice which seems strange (if you choose to 'enhance' then it makes it sound like it is not necessary to 'preserve'). The Parish Council accepts the point however and proposes the following wording: 'Preserve and, where possible, enhance'.
CRAN6C	We have proposed alternative wording in our response to the Examiner's question about CRAN6C.
Local green spaces s, t, u	Amend
CRAN14	The footnote to the policy makes clear that this is only required for major development. No change.
CRAN16C.c.	Agree suggested amendment.
CRAN17	Agree that wording can be moved into supporting text.
5.3	Agreed
5.5	Agreed
5.6	Agreed
Appendix 4.1	Agreed