

## Inspectors Further Response to the Councils Responses to his Questions 6-13

As a general principle, where I have signified that I am content with OPDC's response to my questions and that response includes a suggested modification to the plan, then I am content for that modification to be included and published in the rolling schedule of proposed modifications. Where I have indicated that I am not content with a response, then that modification should not be included in the rolling schedule of proposed modifications unless the OPDC is intending to make the change as a minor modification in any event regardless of any other outcome of discussions.

In the case of the three further responses in this e-mail from OPDC; I am content with the further response to my Q6. Concerning the further responses to my Qs 12, 13 and 16, I understand and concur with the OPDC's desire to avoid unnecessary repetition within the plan. But, there are three kinds of spatial application of policies; those with universal application (which clearly do not need to be repeated in each Place diagram because an applicant or decision maker does not need to ask themselves the question "does this policy apply to this particular site" because, as a universal policy, the answer will always be yes), those with specific application only to a particular site (which clearly should be shown on each Place diagram and the policies map) and those which apply not universally but to a number of sites. My Qs 12,13 and 16 concern these types of circumstance. My concern is that it would be easy for a planning applicant or for a decision maker to overlook the relevance of such policies to a particular site if it is not shown on the places diagram or policies map. I do accept that the additional cross references in the text of paragraphs OON13 and OON14 will help.

Paul Clark  
Inspector