

Copford with Easthorpe Neighbourhood Plan: response to Examiners comments

Thank you for the comments provided, which have enabled review of our draft plan as required.

We respond to concerns raised over two issues: (1) *Potential duplication of Local Plan Policies* and (2) *The apparent contradiction between policies requiring avoidance of rural coalescence and support for development on the car boot sale site at the border with Marks Tey.*

(1) The Copford with Easthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Group (CENPG) have forensically compared the text of our plan with the local plan. The outcomes of this review are compiled into a table of comparison.

In making the comparison, we found this to be a useful exercise. It has shown where our plan adds more information to the LP. Where we found there is overlap we have explained why we feel this is important and / or what more is added through the NHP. In our view this is helpful for the benefit of local residents.

The accompanying table illustrates this and also suggests areas which we, as a group, consider may be appropriate for amendment or deletion in addressing this matter to assist your Examination of the Plan.

(2) In response to the apparent contradiction of policy surrounding the development of the Car Boot Sale Field, we agree. However, we want the Plan to support the aspiration for development in the possible event of the Car Boot site coming forward if certain criteria are met. We have indicated criteria which we hope explains the NHPs intentions in respect of this site, and provides clarity for circumstances where development may be considered acceptable as an exception as follows;

- *The proposal clearly and significantly defines the boundary to avoid coalescence*
- *Such development provides amenity for the residents of Copford with Easthorpe*
- *There is strong local support*

The Settlement Boundary maps were provided to the CENPG by Colchester City Council; they are referenced as Appendix 2 on Page 9 of the draft Plan but do not have this heading or give their provenance on Page 28 of the draft Plan. This would provide clarification.

Similarly, Map 1 on Page 27 of the draft Plan could be referenced more clearly as it gives a good overview of the unique character of the villages, land use and land distribution in the Parish.