

**Responder no.:****REDACTED COMMENTS*****Disclaimer:***

*There are more than 65 feedback responders, with some sending in multiple documents and responses. Many reaching more than 3 pages and including a lot of technical information.*

*This document has been constructed by a volunteer and consists of (as far as possible) data which has been redacted to protect the privacy of those submitting feedback.*

*Some editorial amendments or deletions have been made and in some case this includes whole sections of submitted documents including sections of prefaces, context and/or background information, (particularly provided by consultants) has been removed. This has been done purely in an attempt to make the document more readable, but no actual feedback on the NDP has been removed.*

*Please note that spellings and/or typos and irregular spacings are likely to be a result of the compiling (copy and paste or typing).*

*If you would like to check your own feedback or have any queries with regards to this document, please email [clerk@kingsomborne-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@kingsomborne-pc.gov.uk).*

***FEEDBACK STARTS BELOW:***

We think that the decision to omit certain sites before a fair and balanced assessment was undertaken was incorrect and flawed. They should have all been given consideration on an equal footing from the outset of the process

Site KS7 has all the qualifications to be a LAG. Why has it not been given this status when other areas with lower scores against the criteria have? It's setting within the historic cluster of Manor Farm House, its barns and farmland is vital to be preserved, as borne out by the opinion of the village residents. We request that KS7 is given the status of a LAG prior the finalisation of the NDP. Ludicrously a photo of this field was used to illustrate the Green Spaces document!

We consider that the LVIA was fundamentally wrong to place so much emphasis on the "pre war historic settlement pattern". All of the chosen sites are within or next to Conservation areas, and 4 out of 5 are next to listed buildings or Flood Zone 3 sites. Meanwhile 8 other sites have been excluded because they are not in the "pre war historic settlement pattern" or may have an impact on views. This would seem to indicate that the settlement pattern and views are more important than the preservation of our listed buildings and their surroundings, and the very real threat of severe flooding. We very much hope that the SEA will be done by another different independent body, and will address this imbalance