

North Luffenham Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan

2023– 2037

Consultation Statement



January 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of Engagement and Consultation Activities, Issues and Outcomes	3
Stage I - Testing interest in the Neighbourhood Plan	3
Stage II - Developing and testing the emerging planning policies	4
Stage III - Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation	4
Review of Comments Received	6
Annex A: List of Statutory Consultees	7
Annex B: Consultation Comments and NLPC Responses	8

Abbreviations used in the Main Document: -

Abbreviation	Meaning
EGM	Extraordinary General Meeting
NLPC	North Luffenham Parish Council
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
RCC	Rutland County Council

INTRODUCTION

Fundamental to the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is the need for it to reflect the wishes of the community both now and in the future. Hence, meaningful engagement with all interested parties is vital to ensure that the Aims, Vision and planning policies that are important to the community are identified and used to formulate the Plan itself. This document sets out the measures and activities undertaken by North Luffenham Parish Council (NLPC) to ensure that every local resident and business had the opportunity to express their views, alongside those of the statutory consultees, in order that these could be considered when drafting the Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting documents.

SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES, ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

The NLPC undertook a Village Plan Survey in 2017 ([Village Survey 2017](#)) but it was considered necessary to undertake a new survey to update and refresh the previous findings. However, gathering such support and the views of local residents became more challenging than anticipated due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the resultant restrictions on public gatherings. The Parish Councils consultation approach was adapted accordingly.



Stage I: Testing interest in the Neighbourhood Plan

A virtual presentation of the aims of the NP and the results of the survey were given on three occasions with residents being encouraged to ask questions and make comments. A poster-based exhibition, compliant with the Covid guidelines applicable at the time, was displayed in the Community Centre on two occasions and later in the village church. A full timeline of the consultation activities/engagements of this stage is set out below: -

Date	Action	Purpose
Dec 2019	Flyer to each household, post on website and newsletter regarding interest in a NP	To establish if sufficient interest in the community for a NP
Jan 2020	Public Village Meeting	Communicate the aim of the NP, and gauge interest of the parish
Jan 2020	Steering Group formed following Parish Council resolution to initiate a NP	To enable a programme of community engagement to inform, scope and shape the NP
Jan 2020	Application to Rutland County Council (RCC) for formation of a Neighbourhood Area for the whole of the Parish	To request the start of the formal process of preparing a NP

Feb 2020	Neighbourhood Area designated by RCC	To confirm start of formal process
June 2020	North Luffenham Parish Council agreed to proceed with the production of a Neighbourhood Plan at an Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) on 6 th June 2020.	To approve the preparation of a North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan.

Stage II: Developing and testing the emerging planning policies

The initial engagement to seek the views of residents was a detailed questionnaire, delivered to collected from each household and available to complete online. The responses to the questionnaire were analysed and used as evidence to drive the production of the policies embedded in the new Neighbourhood Plan. The timeline of the various activities is summarised in the table below and the findings are summarised in the [Village Survey 2020](#) document.

Date	Action	Purpose
Aug - Sept 2020	Distribution and collection of NP questionnaire - also available for completion online	To seek the opinions and comments of the residents of the parish
Sept - Oct 2020	Analysis of questionnaire	Amendment of draft policies in view of findings
Nov 2020	Virtual Presentation on three occasions of NP and results of questionnaire.	Information and feedback to residents. Replying to questions and taking note of comments.
Dec 2020	Poster demonstration in the Community Centre on two occasions	As above for residents who may not have or are not used to the Internet
Nov – Dec 2021	Consultation on proposed Local Green Spaces (LGS) with a flyer to the whole parish. Questionnaire available for completion online and at an Exhibition in the Community Centre on three occasions	To seek the opinions and comments of all the residents of the parish on the proposed LGS
Dec 2021	Analysis of questionnaire	Amendment of proposed LGS in view of findings/responses
Jan 2022	Steering Group meeting with major landowners	To present/discuss proposed Landscape Setting Policy and amendments to LGS
Jan 2022	Meeting between external representatives of NLPC and major landowners	To review the level of protection given by the NPPF against speculative development

Stage III: Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Following analysis of the comments received from initial consultation, a Regulation 14 Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan was prepared for wide consultation. The activities and key dates are set out in the table below: -

Date	Action	Purpose
Aug 2022	North Luffenham Parish Council approved the pre-submission version of the NP on 15 th Aug 2022	Authority to commence the formal consultation process
Aug 2022	Draft NP sent to statutory consultees (list provided by RCC – see Annex A)	Seek formal responses from statutory consultees
Aug 2022	Draft NP sent to landowners living outside of the parish with explanatory letters draft policies and formal notification	Seek formal responses from relevant landowners
Aug 2022	Distribution of policies and formal notification to every household. Formal notification also posted online.	Seek formal responses from as many residents as possible
Aug 2022	Paper copies of the draft NP placed in The Fox Public House, Village Community Centre and Oakham Library. Advised in the physical and on-line formal notification that a paper copies could also be loaned out.	Seek formal responses from as many residents as possible
Aug 2022	Poster and banners displayed throughout the parish with contact details	To raise awareness of the consultation process and encourage participation
23 rd Aug 2022	Formal Reg 14 consultation commenced: Online copy of pre-submission draft North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan, NLPC Regulation 14 Consultation Form and Formal Notification posted online	Seek formal responses from as many residents as possible
Sept 2022	Staffed public exhibitions held in the Community Centre, including rolling presentation, paper copies and exhibition display. Paper copies of the draft NP, Parish Analysis & Design Codes, St George's Barracks Masterplan Guidance and Design Codes and supplementary documents. Members of the Neighbourhood Plan group on hand for clarifications and questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd Sept – 14:00 to 16:00 (weekend) • 15th Sept – 8:30 – 20:30 • 28th Sept – 14:30 – 16:30 	Seek formal responses from as many residents as possible. Venue accessible to all and times varied to encourage attendance and participation. Opportunities for questions and clarifications
Oct 2022	Formal Reg 14 consultation closed on 14 October 2022.	Enabled the analysis of comments received.
Jan 2023	North Luffenham Parish Council Approved the Submission version of the NP on 16th January 2023	Authorised the submission of the NP to Rutland Council
Jan 2023	The North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan was formally submitted to RCC on 17 th January 2023	To enable formal consideration of the NP by RCC

REVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED.

The Reg 14 consultation version of the NP incorporated relevant comments from the earlier, Stage I and II community consultations outlined above.

84 individual responses were received from residents which, assuming a parish population of 679, achieved a 12% response rate. In addition, 5 responses were received from the statutory consultees listed in Annex A. The majority of responses commented on multiple policies. As a consequence, to ensure a rigorous, methodical and consistent approach, individual comments were collated by policy and considered systematically by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group established by the Parish Council.

Each comment was considered in terms of its potential impact on the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies. Where the comments were supportive or had no impact on the policy intent or wording, they were noted. In other instances, changes were deemed necessary to the policy wording and/or additional items added to the Parish Initiatives. All such considerations were captured in a spreadsheet and allocated a particular shading category relevant to its impact on the Plan and related documents.

Finally, the Regulation 14 version of Draft North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan was amended accordingly in preparation for its approval by NLPC and formal submission to Rutland County Council in early 2023.

A detailed table containing *all* comments received and the agreed response in relation to each is included as Annex B to this Consultation Statement.

-= Annexes Follow on Next Page =-

ANNEX A:

List of Statutory Consultees

Historic England
East Midlands Council
Highways England
Environment Agency
Natural England
Anglian Water
Rutland County Council
Wildlife Trust
Homes England
National Grid
The Mobile Operators Association
Severn Trent

South Kesteven District Council
Melton Borough Council
NHS E Leicestershire and Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group
NHS Property Services
NHS E Leicestershire and Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group

South Luffenham Parish Council
Edith Weston Parish Council
Lyndon Parish Council
Ketton Parish Council
Pilton Parish Council
Morcott Parish Council

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

ANNEX B:

Consultation Comments and NLPC Responses

Comments Index: -

Policy	Page
NL1: Employment and Community Facilities	8
NL2: Broadband	13
NL3: Residential Development	15
NL4: Natural Environment	20
NL5: River Chater	24
NL6: Local Green Space	26
NL7: Watercourses and Surface Water	35
NL8: Placemaking and Sustainable Design	37
NL9: Historic Environment	42
NL10: Landscape Setting and Separation	44
NL11: Transport and Movement	46

TABLE SHADING KEY

Included In Parish Initiatives	No changes to policy required	Policy Amended	Clarifications
--------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Policy NL1 Comments

Resident	Resident Comment	NLPC Response
Resident 2	I would like to see serious consideration given to a standalone community centre/facility in the village, that can be used for multiple purposes and which would be fit for purpose.	Will be included in the Parish Initiatives Document
Resident 3	Could do with more clarity on where employment space would be suitable in this parish: well served place would be Linecross estate and wireless Hill, even Edith Weston at the NW end of the camp.	Policy is designed to give general support to employment development within the Parish. Each proposal and site would be assessed against the policy criteria via the planning process
Resident 15	Public toilets should be provided in a new large development like the one that may take place at St George's Barracks.	Noted
Resident 22	What criteria determines viability of a community facility? who makes the decision?	This would be part of the planning process

Resident 24	IT MAKES NO SENSE TO CREATE A FACILITY "IN CLOSE PROXIMITY" - JUST USE THAT SPACE FOR WHAT IS PROPOSED AND LEAVE THE EXISTING FACILITY AS IS. WHAT IS YOUR DEFINITION OF "VIABLE"? YOU DO NOT STATE AND THIS IS INCOMPLETE	Policy is designed to ensure facilities remain available to the Parish residents, and to ensure flexibility for future development. Viability would be tested as part of any planning application
Resident 26	There are very few employment opportunities for this with no means of travel. There are also few community opportunities for those in younger age groups.	Recognised, and the NP policies are designed to encourage improvement
Resident 31	In agreement with policy NL1. There is clear enthusiasm within the community to assess village facilities with a view to improving these i.e. community centre	Noted
Resident 33	The church needs to be considered for being a community hub/facility. I could be a fabulous multi-purpose venue for social, cultural, community and business events with a little imagination and improvements on basic facilities.	Noted and the policy would support any development required for this. Expansion of the role of the Church building will be included in the Parish Initiatives
Resident 37	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks.</p> <p>Policy NL1 seeks to support development which diversifies the rural economy and the range of community facilities. The Neighbourhood Plan supporting evidence identifies the existing facilities and services, including a community centre, a church and The Oval, a designated local green space. The Neighbourhood Plan states that these are valued by residents of the parish and fundamental to maintaining a good quality of life.</p> <p>The DIO are supportive of Policy NL1 and agree that existing community facilities and services should be protected and enhanced. Any future development at the St George's Barrack's site would incorporate a mix of development, to benefit new and existing residents, including those from North Luffenham.</p>	Noted
Resident 43	To have extra employment will always bring some noise/ disturbance/ extra traffic etc . Community will have to accept it.	Noted - Planning process would assess the impact
Resident 46	Any loss of community facility must also be supported by or with prior agreement to Parish residents.	Noted
Resident 48	Approve subject to adherence to Policy NL4, natural environment and sound overseeing of the policy.	Noted

Resident 55	It is very important that employment opportunities are encouraged. I am thinking particularly of my teenage daughters. One of whom works in the Fox. This is ideal as she can walk to work. It is also vital that community facilities are kept and indeed enhanced. I would welcome a structure on the oval that could be used all year round. I would like to teach my yoga classes in the village. I currently put them on in other village halls!	Noted, Parish Initiatives will investigate the possibility of facilities improvements
Resident 61	Endeavours should be made to increase employment opportunities in the Parish, to reverse the drift towards a dormitory / retirement community. Community facilities are also critical to ensure a cohesive village population, retaining the sense of belonging that attracts people to small villages.	Policy Supports this view
Resident 64	APPROVE PROVIDING THIS IS NOT GOING TO RESULT AT ANYTIME IN UNSUITABLE INDUSTRY AND URBINISATION	Noted - Planning process would assess and manage any adverse impact
Resident 67	As Rector I have an obvious interest in the local perception of the church, with Table 5.1.1 describing the church as valued by the community. Locally church buildings are regularly used by a tiny minority of the village most of the year yet appreciated for baptisms/weddings/funerals and on special occasions. The regular congregation is mainly elderly and I have buried almost 25% of it in the past 5 years. The extent to which the church being 'valued by the community' is translated into practical action and financial support by the wider village community will determine if it remains 'viable'. (Our challenge here is replicated across the country; there will need to be national solutions.) If North Luffenham wants to retain an open church and other community facilities, these need positive support, not a passive approach, which goes beyond planning matters. The Policy 2b seems somewhat fatalistic.	Noted, and the policy is intended to support any future development to ensure the continuing viability of the facility. Expansion of the role of the Church building will be included in the Parish Initiatives

<p>Resident 72</p>	<p>It is important to consider any new development of employment or community facilities in the light of the sustainable community as a whole. All development should consider the future viability of the village community and seek to enhance the viability of the community. It is apparent in many rural communities nowadays that the community is largely made up of an ageing population which over time can lead to decreased activity within the village and a feeling of a moribund community that is neither conducive or welcoming to new dwellers within the community. This is not the case in North Luffenham as things are at present, the prevention of such an occurrence is something that must always be factored in when considering any type of new development. In terms of community facilities and planning for the future it is important to consider new options in the light of the comments made in this Plan. The Plan talks about only supporting loss of facilities when there is a similar one close by or they are no longer viable. A village's welfare and vibrancy is integrally tied up with its ability to function as a social entity with strong community interaction, therefore I feel it is essential that the Plan includes reference to that fact and to maintenance of that status. It is important that in a plan for the future this fact is recognised and there is a provision for improving opportunities for social interaction within the village community. Current community facilities do not allow for larger community gatherings unless these are outside. Indoor facilities, (the Cricket Pavilion, The Bowls Club House, The Community Centre) all have both limited capacity and in the case of the Cricket Pavilion, limited disabled access.) Some of these facilities are in a poor state of repair and need a lot of "refurbishment" to meet a modern standard. During the Platinum Jubilee celebrations it was noted that the toilet facilities at the Pavilion were in a very poor state and reflected very badly on the village as a whole, and, given their state, were probably not compliant for disabled use. Consideration also needs to be given to internal capacity when making allowance for disabled access. Consideration of room size, door widths, number of emergency accesses in line with licensing for fire regulations and crowd size regulations all need to be taken into account. Enhancing and increasing the use of the Cricket Pavilion may present a problem of noise to nearby residential properties, as may be on road parking etc. The same could hold true for the other venues mentioned. Therefore, in the light of the stated intention to avoid these negative impacts, whilst attempting to provide modern suitable community facilities I feel mention should be made of creating new purpose built facilities on a new site to provide an "umbrella" of opportunities to</p>	<p>Improvements to Community Facilities will be part of the Parish Initiatives</p>
---------------------------	--	--

	<p>enhance facilities for the village. This could be sited on the edge of the village providing space for a new Village Hall - fit for purpose under all current building regulations- plus an opportunity to provide the possibility of an outreach medical centre, additional parking for the village which could be used by as mobile bank. Such a development would provide a great village enhancement whilst removing "nuisance" to the margins. There is also a possibility of solving a number of "on road" parking issues. (See later comment.) Such a development could easily fit with Policy NL4 and indeed may provide enhanced opportunities to realise NL4.</p>	
Resident 79	Policy NL4 natural environment should be fully implemented	Noted
Resident 80	The village is growing in vibrancy and will need more community facilities to accommodate this.	Noted and will be included in the Parish Initiatives
RCC Comments	Must' Can we require this? consider 'should ' and including 'where the supporting infrastructure is available' within the policy?	No Change

Policy NL2 Comments

Resident	Resident Comment	NLPC Response
Resident 4	Yes!! But we also need much more security on our landline supply.	Noted
Resident 25	NO COMMENT	
Resident 27	As someone who works from home where the internet can be hit or miss, this is extremely important for today's businesses and supporting young families that require internet access for their studies.	Noted
Resident 28	And should also be built to be carbon neutral, heat source pumps, solar panel and good insulation	Covered under Sustainable design (See Policy NL8)
Resident 32	The natural aim here has to be to facilitate this to all homes.	Noted, however this is beyond the scope of the NP
Resident 38	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks.</p> <p>Policy NL2 seeks to ensure that new development, including employment space and new homes includes high speed fibre optic cable broadband infrastructure.</p> <p>The DIO are supportive of this policy.</p>	Noted
Resident 41	HIGH SPEED BORADBAND SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE WHOLE VILLAGE	Noted, however this is beyond the scope of the NP
Resident 42	Commensurate with cost i.e.. cost/benefit analysis (cost was underlined)	Noted
Resident 47	FTTP should only be rolled out to new developments once all existing properties of the parish have been given FTTP access.	Noted, however this is beyond the scope of the NP
Resident 48	Positive asset as High speed internet & cable broadband improve use for Companies & individuals.	Noted
Resident 49	To include the same opportunity for all residents of North Luffenham to have high speed-optic broadband	Noted, however this is beyond the scope of the NP
Resident 53	should also cover pre-existing housing	Noted, however this is beyond the scope of the NP

Resident 54	essential for 2022 living and working and beyond	Noted
Resident 56	We must have good broadband to enable people to work from home. This is particularly important as the phone lines keep going down!	Noted
Resident 58	I feel this facility should be provided to all households within the village.	Noted, however this is beyond the scope of the NP
Resident 62	Up to date Internet infrastructure is critical to ensuring the quality of life (WFH, Access to online public services, online schooling etc) for the village is retained. Employment and business options are also enhanced by good access to the Internet	Noted
Resident 65	AGAIN, AS LONG AS THIS 'EMPLOYMENT' SPREE DOES NOT RESULT IN UNWANTED URBINISATION.	Relates to NL1, would be managed via the planning process
Resident 73	Lack of inclusion should be seen as an immediate bar to approval by the PC	Noted
Resident 80	Availability should be across North Luffenham residents/businesses	Noted, however this beyond the scope of the NP
Resident 81	Absolutely essential for the village to keep up with the latest connectivity particularly with some many working from home.	Noted

Policy NL3 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 4	Should be some mention of parking provision for new developments [not just bin storage!].	Mentioned in the plan - NL11 Also covered in Design Codes for North Luffenham Parish and SGB Masterplan
Resident 13	See comments on NL8	Noted
Resident 15	12 strategic objectives is far too many and, as set out, just a wish list. Objectives 2, 3 9 and 12 should be prioritized as they deal with our rural environment, truly affordable housing, and essential infrastructure.	Noted
Resident 16	Point 1 should be changed to '... may be supported...'. Car parking should be off-road. All development should include provision for adequate car parking within the development site and it should be off road to avoid people parking on the pavement.	Replacing the wording to 'May be supported' would create an unclear policy. Parking is dealt with in policy NL11
Resident 27	As long as the houses really are 'affordable'.	Affordable is specific designation based on national criteria
Resident 29	Do NOT want everyone putting new houses in their gardens	Noted However the RCC Local Plan does allow for infill development. This policy constrains how this development can be implemented
Resident 32	Whilst villages have to evolve it is important that any new residential developments are kept within the planned limits of development.	Noted
Resident 34	Off road parking should be mandatory for any new development	Parking is dealt with in Policy NL11. Parking standards are in the Adopted Local Plan. The transport policy seeks to augment the Local Plan requirements, rather than changing parking standards.

<p>Resident 38</p>	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks. Policy NL3 has been designed to give high level guidance on acceptable development locations. The Parish's own community survey identifies a need for future housing development in the village, to provide a range of property types to meet the needs of families, downsizers and to include affordable tenures. Future development should be sympathetic and maintain the character of the village. The pre-text to the Policy seeks to support housing development at suitable locations within the parish, and ensure development is in keeping with the character and setting of the existing housing and landscape. The Policy itself is clear that new residential development will be supported within the Planned Limits of Development, through the conversion of existing buildings and development which infills gaps within existing built frontages. Any sites which are allocated for residential development and include employment space would be supported. Encouraging the development of small-scale brownfield sites (circa 5 – 10 homes) is a valuable approach to housing delivery and does offer a meaningful and sustainable supply of new homes, but this is only part of the approach. The NPPF recognises that the supply of a large number of new homes is required and often best achieved through planning for larger scale development, including the previously identified new community at St George's Barracks (as allocated in the now withdrawn Local Plan). The St George's Barracks site is an existing brownfield site, which will soon cease to operate for its original purpose. The development potential of the Site includes opportunities to create a new sustainable community, through the creation of new homes, new jobs, the re-use of existing buildings, protection of heritage and landscapes, and enhancements which will benefit new and existing communities if planned correctly. This is the only significant site which can provide a larger scale development to deliver a truly sustainable new community, as demonstrated throughout Rutland Council's own evidence base documents. The St George's Barracks site is a sustainable, viable and deliverable development site and the largest brownfield site in the County. The DIO suggest that the policy as worded does not allow sufficient flexibility for future development, including opportunities at St George's Barracks, which is currently not included in the Planned Limits of Development boundary for North Luffenham or Edith Weston. The Neighbourhood Plan refers to the Planned Limits of Development as per the adopted Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document, adopted in 2014</p>	<p>Noted. The NP reflects and supports the adopted Local Plan. This current Plan designates North Luffenham as a Small Service Centre, with only infill development permitted. Feedback from our Parishioners did not indicate any need or desire to expand on this in the Neighbourhood Plan. We therefore did not undertake a Housing Needs Assessment. Rutland County Council, in their new Local Plan will be the relevant authority to designate new sites for development, in accordance with the overall strategic need within the County.</p>
---------------------------	--	---

	<p>and includes extracts from this document, however this will become outdated when a new Local Plan is adopted. The DIO have made representations, in response to the recent Rutland Council Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation, to require that the Planned Limits of Development boundary should be amended to include the St George's Barracks site. As set out above, the St Georges Barracks site is an established area of brownfield land. As per NPPF Paragraph 119 and Strategic Objective 10 of the Issues and Options Plan, this category of land should be used for development. The purpose of the 'Limits of Development' boundary is to identify existing built-up areas and brownfield land where development is considered to be acceptable in principle. The St Georges Barracks site clearly meets the definition of brownfield land and is an established area of built form in Edith Weston. It is therefore suggested that the Limits of Development are amended to include the St George's Site which will promote sustainable brownfield development and create a new area of planned growth without encroaching into undeveloped areas of the landscape. This echoes the position in the emerging design guidance for the North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan (and Edith Weston) which shows development on the St Georges site and includes a Design guide. In this regard, the DIO suggest that Policy NL3: Residential Development should incorporate a reference to St George's Barracks and should include explicit support for the appropriate development of previously developed land – as advocated by National and Local Planning Policy. As set out below, the DIO have also requested that a separate policy should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan in relation to future development at the St George's Barracks site, especially given the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan documents include a design guide for the Site, currently without any policy hook to give it weight. Finally, the DIO would note that Rutland Council have recently published a new consultation in respect of Rutland's Interim Housing Position Statement, which is open to the public between 26 September and 28 October. The DIO would request clarification in respect of how the Parish have evidenced their housing need, in line with Rutland Council requirements.</p>	
Resident 42	<p>Infill is fine, but new developments will require careful consideration (Infill and new <u>underlined</u>)</p>	<p>This is the intention of the policy</p>
Resident 44	<p>Over time all villages have grown, you can't stop time. Better to have larger villages than a monster on the airfield.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Resident 45	What does 'tenure blind' mean?	Affordable / Social Housing is mixed in with private housing and cannot obviously be differentiated
Resident 47	Our disapproval is with item "Infill development of gaps within existing built frontages".	Infill development is permitted under the Local Plan, this policy seeks to manage any infill development
Resident 48	Village is nice a shame to change it.	Noted
Resident 49	Approve, as long as they are within the limits of 1, 2, 3, 4 outlined above.	Noted
Resident 54	excellent ideas	Noted
Resident 63	Currently there is no observed requirement to expand development beyond the current village PLD boundary. Once it becomes clear what will happen to St Georges Barracks, this policy may need to be revisited.	Noted
Resident 65	Item 4 not acceptable.	
Resident 66	THIS IS NOT RURAL! REGARDING NOTE NO. 4. REGARDING AFFORDABLE THIS IS NOT SUITABLE FOR A SMALL VILLAGE LOCATION.	A mixture of housing types in any approved development has been strongly supported through various surveys.
Resident 69	The current conversion of a huge modern barn into housing at the Settings fits poorly with an my idea of conversion of redundant agricultural buildings (it's like the 3 barns outside Ridlington, which looks like new builds on the footprint of previous modern barns). As new agricultural buildings can be built with fewer restrictions than houses, is there any way to discourage conversion of moderns/new build barns? With energy costs so high, do any comments on insulation standards want to be included?	This is covered by Class Q of Permitted Development regulations, and is therefore outside of the Neighbourhood Plan
Resident 74	I agree with item three, but the phraseology is very woolly and is very open to individual interpretation potentially leading to dispute. The same holds true for the phrase "mixed use elements" in section 4. Whilst some examples of this are given the blanket support of a rather open-ended comment may lead to disputes where interpretation of "mixed use elements" is taken in a loose or liberal way by a developer going forward.	The policy clause 4 describes the mixed-use elements. The word 'including' will be replaced with 'where it comprises'.
Resident 81	The balance of requirements should reflect both residential and business	Noted
Resident 82	I believe tenure blind housing developments are a must.	Noted
Resident 83	I am not sure much if any residential development is needed in the parish. If proposals come forward, I would expect them to be very carefully designed to maintain the character of the village. I do not see that any large-scale housing development, as once proposed on the site of St George Barracks, is in any way needed.	Noted

Resident 84	? requirement for screened bins. This Rutland mot Buckingham Palace!	Noted
RCC Comments	Use of 'must' can this be required, suggest linking back to NL1, only if the proposal accords with the criteria in this policy	Regarding bin storage "Must" will be retained. Add reference to Policy NL1 at the end of Clause 4 "Having regard to NL1"

Policy NL4 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 4	"Wildlife habitats" may here be specified too tightly and become a legacy problem: better to have a more generalised list, and provide for updates as the environment changes	The policy says "including" various habitats which allows for all relevant scenarios to be addressed.
Resident 10	too restrictive	Noted
Resident 16	In points 1 and 2 the word 'should' would be better replaced with 'must' and remove word 'overall' - 'development must not have an adverse impact on any rural and natural environments'. In point 2, the bullet that starts 'inclusion of swift boxes...' replace the first 3 instances of 'or' with commas and the final 'or' with 'and'. In the bullet beginning 'Green..' replace 'and/or' with 'and' as all of these things could be used, if appropriate, rather than just one of them.	"Should" is taken from the NPPF text on biodiversity. "Overall" acknowledges that development will have impact, however Planning policy balances this by mitigation with environmental gain. Current text is considered appropriate.
Resident 25	ALL APPROVED DEVELOPMENT SHOULD HAVE MANDATORY SOLAR PANELS ON ALL ROOFS AS WELL AS MANDATORY BASEMENTS, TO ENSURE FUTURE VIABILITY AND PROPER FOUNDATIONS (RESPECTIVELY). NO NEED FOR SOLAR FARMS ON LAND THEN	This comment does not appear to relate to Policy NL4. Policy NL8 deals with design, including green design. Solar panels can't be mandatory. However, the interpretation makes reference to them. Foundations are a matter for Building Regulations.
Resident 28	Coupled with above, the parish council should enhance the scheme on its trust field to plant more trees and give a free open space for the village	Will be included in Parish Initiatives
Resident 38	Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks. The DIO support the proposed policy and encourage the need to protect and enhance North Luffenham's rural and natural environment.	Noted
Resident 39	Approved as long as the funding and the will is there to manage these environments especially the trees	Noted
Resident 42	New developments should be carefully considered, commensurate with the existing local environment.	Noted

Resident 47	Any development should include the enhancement of the local natural environment. A study and survey should be carried out to formally identify current unknown areas of strong and healthy natural zones/areas prior to any development so that they can be preserved and/or developed.	Environmental Impact Assessment required for all major development NL4.2 reflects the NPPF obligation for 10% increase in net biodiversity per development
Resident 49	Who would be 'policing' these bio diversity issues in any future planning for North Luffenham?	This would be covered by the monitoring implemented after the Neighbourhood Plan is "made"
Resident 54	sensitive and sustainable - very wise.	Noted
Resident 56	It is imperative that nature is preserved. We must protect habitats and green spaces for biodiversity. Our village is a haven for many species of birds, animals and insects. We must ensure that any future development is sensitive to the natural landscape.	Noted
Resident 62	The rural nature of the village setting is very important to the residents. Once areas of natural environment are lost, they are very rarely recovered. Avoiding loss of valuable natural habitats should be given high priority with any proposed development	Noted
Resident 65	VERY IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THIS.	Noted
Resident 73	Given the destruction recently of at least one TPO Lime tree and the severe pollarding of another within the village boundaries under the excuse that the trees were in such a poor condition they must be removed, despite only recently having been inspected and protected, it is clear that what is stated as an intention in section 3 is probably not sufficient. From other conversations about other trees within the village, many with TPO's it is clear that these may also be in a poor state, and therefore subject, possibly, to removal due to poor maintenance over the years. I believe there needs to be a proactive statement to the effect that all mature trees and native hedgerows should not only be retained but judiciously maintained to prevent damage or the need for felling because of poor management. There should be a proactive management of all mature trees and hedgerows.	The Trees in question had a temporary TPO recinded prior to the work being carried out. NL4.3 specifically mentions retention of tree etc.

<p>Resident 78</p>	<p>While I support the general thrust of these policies there is one point of detail that is now very poorly worded (and differs from the wording used in early drafts of the neighbourhood plan) and a number of policy omissions.</p> <p>The serious error concerns the policy for the inclusion of nest boxes for birds. This was drafted to make clear that INTEGRAL swift bricks (those physically built into the fabric of the building) are the preferred option. These are maintenance free and are effectively there for the lifetime of the building. The latest generation of such bricks (see: https://www.actionforswifts.com/) also provide space for other cavity nesting birds such as starling and house sparrow. By contrast eternal nest boxes have only a limited life and require maintenance to ensure they remain safely attached to any structure. I'd suggest that this policy is reworded to reflect this preference. In addition, the policy could be reworded to encourage the take up of multiple options - at the moment it is worded that implies that only one of five options need to be used. I'd suggest the use of the following wording: Inclusion of integral swift bricks (for swifts, starlings and sparrows) and/or bat boxes or other features to support wildlife (such as specialist nest boxes for barn owls and house martins) ;</p> <p>I also feel this policy does not go far enough in securing biodiversity measures for swifts. A more robust policy, that requires all new development to include the equivalent of one swift brick per new dwelling, would be a more progressive approach. This does not mean that every new house has to have swift bricks, swifts are a colonial species so swift bricks are best used in groups, with, say, every sixth house having six boxes (an approach that could be spelt out in the policy). I appreciate that concerns have been expressed about creating a requirement for all homes to have a swift brick as some people don't like birds close to them however this can be overcome by the caveat described above and by only requiring the application of this policy to developments of 2 or more houses. That way a private one-off development, of a single dwelling, would not be required to include swift bricks unless they wanted to. I note that the Neighbourhood Plan says that (in relation to wildlife corridors) "This plan seeks to encourage development proposals to make a positive contribution to the conservation and enhancement of these wildlife corridors"; however, despite earlier (pre-publication) drafts of the NP containing a policy that enacted this aspiration there is now no policy to deliver what the plan says it wishes to achieve. this is a serious omission and should be corrected. Arguably the wildlife corridor policy should go</p>	<p>Text will be changed to "Integral Swift boxes".</p> <p>Landscape and Edges Chapter 4.4.8 references protection for wildlife corridors and support for new wildlife corridors</p>
---------------------------	---	---

	<p>further and afford these areas protection from development that would prevent their future management for wildlife and biodiversity. The absence of a policy to support development proposals whose primary purpose is the enhancement of biodiversity within the parish is disappointing. The current suite of policies is all about limiting the impact of new development and seeking to secure small amounts of biodiversity gain when new development is proposed. In addition to this approach, it would be good to see the inclusion of a policy that provides positive support for development proposals that enhance the biodiversity of the village, for example a project to create new ponds or wetlands within the parish should be welcomed.</p>	
Resident 80	Needs a very good quantitative environment risk assessment. NLPC should ensure this is complied with in consultation with RCC.	All development planning applications would be assessed for environmental impact
Resident 81	Our rural location is very special and one of the reasons we moved to the village. Whilst many of the policies have a positive local impact, they are also crucial in contributing the wider challenges facing our environment such as climate change. Such policies and actions should no longer be optional.	Noted
Resident 82	I am profoundly opposed to the removal or substantial pruning of ancient mature trees in the parish, including pruning in such a way as to reshape the tree except to preserve its health. Proposals that call for such removals or dramatic pruning should in principle be refused unless it is demonstrated that substantial community benefits will ensue and that no other pathway to achieving such benefits exists.	Decisions on the precise activity allowed on trees with TPO's and in the Conservation Area is a part of the Planning Application Process. Covered in NL4.3
RCC Comments	<p>Environment Act 2021 - Date should be November 2023. Does this apply to all planning applications, and/or inside/outside the planned limits of development?</p> <p>How would a proposal demonstrate it will have no overall adverse impact</p> <p>Is this for all planning applications?</p> <p>How will this 10% net gain be required as part of a planning application? How would a proposal demonstrate the gain? What if the development doesn't take the opportunities to enhance? May not be enough to justify a refusal on this policy.</p>	<p>Plan document will be updated with correct date. The policy applies to rural and natural environments. This clearly includes the rural area but could include trees and landscape features in the built settlement. This text will be added to the interpretation. "Regarding assessment of impact, this would be via the planning process, including if required, an Environmental Impact Assessment."</p> <p>This is an encouraging clause. The Environment Act 2021 and supporting guidance will make clear how to assess any Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>

Policy NL5 Comments

Survey Comments	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 4	This is more than about River Chater, important though that is.	Noted
Resident 16	Include in the bullets points that the development must also not increase to risk of flooding from the river.	Noted. Covered in NL7
Resident 25	ALL DEVELOPMENT MUST HAVE MANDATORY MEASURES IN PLACE DURING CONSTRUCTION, SO THAT IF EVER THERE IS FLOODING, NO WASTEWATER/EFFLUENT (ETC) CAN BE DISCHARGED INTO ANY RIVER/WATERWAY (ETC)	Noted. Covered under the planning process. NL7
Resident 49	As long as The Environment Agency comply with the points stated above. Again a 'policing issue'.	Noted
Resident 56	The River Chater must be preserved as must the habitats around it	Noted
Resident 57	not really aware of public access to the river	There is minimal public access to the river, however this does not mean it cannot / should not be protected
Resident 62	The River Chater water systems are an intrinsic part of the Parish, and should be protected and improved where possible, particularly with regard to water quality.	Noted
Resident 78	Some of the wording in this policy is confused. It states that there should be 'no adverse impact on small scale enclosures with traditional walling and hedges'. As far as I am aware there are, within the parish, no traditional walls within the floodplain of the Chater (where they would be washed away by flood events) and none of the fields (if that is what is meant by enclosures) are notably small. It is therefore not possible to understand the intention of this policy. I'd also suggest adding an extra feature to this list: 'Hydromorphology' (meaning the shape and form of the river and its tributaries) as this could be negatively impacted by any large scale development proposals.	The reference to traditional walling and hedges will be retained as it remains relevant Reference to "the shape and form of the river and its tributaries (Hydromorphology)" will be added to the policy
Resident 73	I would go further and say that not only should any development not have an adverse impact, but any development should actually contribute to a positive impact on the items listed. In other sections there is mention of active interventions for birds, bats, etc. therefore it makes sense to talk of active	Noted. Improvement is not mentioned in the policy.

	intervention in habitats here such as developing habitats for water voles, otters etc.	
Resident 80	We know our rivers are being contaminated, we need to ensure our stretch of The Chater is regularly checked by the Environment Agency	Noted - However ongoing river management is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Resident 81	Even though it can't be seen from many parts of the village, the river is an important and integral part of our local environment and should be protected and where possible enhanced for the greater good.	Noted. Improvement is not mentioned in the policy
RCC Comments	How will a development proposal demonstrate/justify this?	The list in the policy sets out the landscape sensitivities. B will be moved to NL4 as this is an error.

Policy NL6 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 1	Transcribed from paper return: written against LGS: Space at Butt Lane, 'Where is this??	Each LGS has an accompanying outline location plan.
Resident 5	Butt Lane space is over-rated, not least because it is far from natural. The Water Garden OUGHT to become a feature but it is not today: needs a lot of planning, thinking about access and signposting	Arranging public access is outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan. As the Water Gardens are private land, signposting is not appropriate.
Resident 10	Overall, I agree with this with the exception of the water garden. This is privately owned and therefore I can't understand why it would be designated a Local Green Space. If so, how many other private gardens in the village should be designated a LGS? It makes no sense and may give the impression that the water garden is open access	The space is visible from a public footpath running alongside the area, and it is an important Green Space with a unique heritage, however the designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development
Resident 11	You are missing some other important green spaces. the area between Newmans Close and Ancaster Way is a significant green space.	The space has been previously considered and failed to meet the criteria for an LGS
Resident 12	This is private land, there is no public benefit to have it designated. Yesterday I saw trespassers in the private land who said they thought it was publicly owned. designation adds to the security risks of the area and is disproportionate. when characterising this area as being of historic importance it should be remembered that this garden was completed in 1930 and there are several other gardens in the village which arguably by age should therefore also be considered before this space.	Designation of LGS does not promote, allow or enable public access to the land. however, the designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development

Resident 14	I have commented previously on the PC's determination to include LGS1 and LGS2, which are already protected by virtue of the Charity Commission Trust Deed, which specifies their use. Moreover, I believe that landowners have been consulted in relation to their willingness for their land to be allocated as Local Green Space. It is important that the PC, in its capacity as charity trustee (and not in its capacity as a local government organisation) has seriously considered its view on this issue. It is perhaps relevant that the affordable housing now comprising Geoff Sewell Close was built specifically for the benefit of individuals brought up in, or with a connection to, North Luffenham. My understanding is that this was achieved by means of the then PC, as trustee of this land, (which at the time was part of the Field Gardens) obtaining the agreement of the Charity Commission that this use should be permitted due to its being of benefit to the beneficiaries of the trust. Has the PC as trustee consciously given up the opportunity to use its asset for the benefit of the village in a similarly creative way in the future?	LGS 1 only covers the Allotments and Woodland walk areas (Map will be amended to clarify) the remaining field area is excluded and allows future flexibility for the benefit of the Parish. LGS2(The Oval) will be removed from the designations due to existing protection as advised by RCC
Resident 17	New developments should include new local green spaces within the development site.	This would be part of the planning process for any new development
Resident 24	I would not like to see the openness of the Oval reduced any further by the addition of further fixed play equipment. Its openness is a key part of its attractiveness, i.e., as a cricket pavilion, village green.	Noted
Resident 26	NO COMMENT	
Resident 27	It is very important to keep the village as it is!	Noted

<p>Resident 39</p>	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to designate four new Local Green Spaces. This includes Site LGS3 – Butt Lane. The Local Green Space (LGS) Supporting Document provides the context to this proposed designation. The DIO would raise concern that the LGS document states the status of the lane is unknown. The ownership and status should be resolved in advance of any proposed designation. The DIO would contest the appropriateness of such a designation for Butt Lane. The purpose of the Local Green Space designation is to provide special protection for important green spaces. Butt Lane, whilst well used and important for walkers, does not constitute a Green Space and should not be designated as LGS3. The Lane is an adopted highway and comprises a single carriageway with hardstanding, which is required for vehicle access to the DIO owned land (including the north of Butt Lane), and adjoining land uses. Imposing strict policy to prevent all development (or works) except in very special circumstances is unnecessary and does not serve the primary purpose of the lane as highway. Whilst the lane has green hedges and is well used for walking, it is not appropriate to designate as a Local Green Space. The DIO object to the proposed designation.</p>	<p>This area was highlighted by many residents during our surveys. LGS Designation would not impede vehicle access to the DIO</p>
<p>Resident 42</p>	<p>NO MENTION OF THE GREEN SPACE ON ANCASTER WAY THIS NEED MAINTENANCE AND LOOKING AFTER.</p>	<p>This space did not meet the LGS criteria. Also, maintenance falls outside of the scope of the plan.</p>
<p>Resident 43</p>	<p>No monstrous carbuncle on the face of a much loved and elegant friend, please</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Resident 44	<p>LGS4 its private land. LGS4 is the only private garden that has been included in the scheme. There is no risk that this site could be developed and the designation of LGS4 within the draft Neighbourhood Plan is inappropriate and unnecessary. It would be a disproportionate use of to the LGS scheme, which should recognise that an individual should not have his freedoms/ interests limited or interfered with beyond the degree necessary in the public interest. Designation of LGS4 would provide no additional benefit to the residents of North Luffenham or any other members of the public but it would significantly prejudice the current landowners. By allocating this land to be included in the green space scheme the public profile/presence of the privately owned water gardens will be raised and therefore public interest will increase. Having purchased this site earlier in the year, I can confirm that there is no public right of way over the site. However, since we purchased the land, we have already suffered from members of the public trespassing on the property on numerous occasions. These trespassers have included residents of the village who know that the property is private. This is not only worrying from a security perspective but also exposes us to the potential for public liability insurance issues. Should the water gardens be designated a green space we believe that this issue would be exacerbated further, which would mean that we would have no alternative but to screen it from public view and significantly increase security measures to combat the increased threat of trespass and insurance liabilities.</p>	<p>Whilst the fact that the land is privately owned does not preclude the LGS designation, this will be reviewed to assess the impact on the landowner, and the level of restriction it would introduce. There is no intention to remove current Permitted Development rights. The designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development</p>
Resident 48	<p>Any new development must not interfere (directly or indirectly) to these local green spaces. Any new development should also contribute in some form to the upkeep/enhancement of these areas.</p>	<p>This is the intention of the LGS Designation</p>
Resident 52	<p>The Water Garden has been overgrown/neglected in recent years. It would be nice to see it restored to its former state. with stone walling repaired.</p>	<p>LGS4 The Water Gardens is private land with no public access; however, the designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development</p>
Resident 55	<p>Quality of green space is a key to the local environment for residents like me</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Resident 56	<p>I am curious as to why areas such as the fields to the south of North Luffenham Hall, Ellis Farm and the east of Edith Weston Road have not been included.</p>	<p>This was due to the restrictions LGS designation would have on the agricultural activities of the fields</p>

Resident 57	It the Oval in particular is an extremely special place. I visit at least once a day with my dog. I have walked my children across it every morning and every afternoon throughout the time at the school. It is a special place.	Noted
Resident 58	don't know where LGS3 and LGS4 are	Each LGS has an accompanying outline location plan.
Resident 63	The areas identified are very important to the residents of the Parish, and the granting of Local Green Space designation will ensure they are protected from any future development proposals.	Noted
Resident 72	<p>Designation LGS4 - The Water Garden: As a matter of principle, it is important that we protect and preserve elements of our parish that are of historic significance. Whilst public access is not always available to such locations, this should not stop them being recognised and designated as Local Green Space. The Garden was designed in 1929 for the owners of North Luffenham Hall and was a highly acclaimed piece of work. Although it does not have public access, it is visible from the public footpath adjacent to the site. It is considered to be of Historic Significance to the parish. I have several concerns with the proposed designation of an area of our private garden, The Water Gardens, as Local Green Space (LGS). We recognise that a LGS does not need to be in public ownership. However, best practice and of course as a matter of common courtesy, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. At no point have we been contacted in advance to discuss the possibility that our private land may be included in the neighbourhood plan as a LGS and what our views would be. This is a complete failure to consult appropriately. It may be that this is because the village was considering at one stage to attempt to raise money to purchase the site and therefore presumed by this time it would be in public ownership. Indeed, no other private land in the village has been included in the LGS proposal.</p> <p>Earlier proposals to use LGS designation in relation to other private land has caused significant upset in the community and these sites have now been withdrawn from the scheme. The purpose of this designation is to protect valuable open spaces from development other than in very special circumstances. The designation of a site as a LGS does not in any way require changes to the management of the site or allow public access. In fact, the Government's guidance on designating LGS clearly states</p>	<p>Whilst the fact that the land is privately owned does not preclude the LGS designation, the designation has been reviewed to assess the impact on the landowner, and the level of restriction it would introduce. The designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development</p>

that LGS designation does not confer any rights of public access over what exists at present. There is no proposal for development of this site, the owners positively embrace the site's conservation merits. Such designations as this act to dramatically undermine site value, inhibit investment, and therefore foster negativity in the property owner. Since the designation imposes no new restrictions or obligations on us as the landowner, we will respond in a way that we see fit should the land be designated as a LGS. Given the level of trespass we currently experience we are certain the LGS will only increase this problem for us and therefore we will seek to screen the area from public view and increase the level of fencing to secure our private garden from unwanted intruders. The water gardens have never been available for use by the community nor are they within the current designated settlement area. Accordingly, they already have protection from development under current National planning policies. One of the tests for LGS is that it is demonstrably special to the local community. In all honesty, how many people in North Luffenham even know about its existence never mind feels its special and holds a particular interest. It may perhaps fulfil these criteria for one or two villagers but that's about the extent of it. I am certain it would not be possible to demonstrate a majority of villagers have any interest whatsoever.

102. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:

- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

Is the site (an overgrown pond) demonstrably special to the local community?
I found this suggested methodology for testing this and this designation fails in spades.

Method Assessment - Evidence of local support, submitted evidence will be reviewed to determine: How the site was identified? Was it instigated by the community or parish council? Or an individual? Was it raised at a meeting or

	<p>through a survey? Has the site been subject to discussion or planning processes before? Is there a petition? Are the signatures from local people? Does the petition relate to just this one site? Do the letters of support show that they clearly understand the justification for designating the site as a Local Green Space? Was the site received favourably during consultations? Does the evidence show that a large proportion of the community use or value the site? Have there been any objections to the designation? Who are these from and on what grounds is the objection made? Do their comments undermine or cast doubt on how special the site may be to the wider community? Is there a need for Local Green Space in this location? Is there a shortage of accessible green space in the area? Is there evidence of a need for this type of space in?</p>	
Resident 73	<p>As the water gardens are on private grounds, I do not see how and why this should be allocated to become a green space. It is in PRIVATE LAND...</p>	<p>That the land is privately owned does not preclude the LGS designation, however the designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development</p>

Resident 74	<p>This section appears to have reined back on earlier LGS submissions. I do not view this as a retrograde step but would ask whether all the current local green spaces actually achieve the stated aims of a local green space. LGS's need to live up to the stated aims, especially around accessibility, for all members of the community.</p> <p>There is talk of making The Oval more accessible with a perimeter path for wheelchair users and other groups with special needs. This is laudable but comes with issues that need to be considered at the outset. If these paths are only to be used in the summer months that is okay, but if they are designed to be used all year-round consideration must be given to the need for additional lighting along their route. This is particularly important for persons with visual disability, especially the older person with vision loss due to eye conditions such as age-related macular degeneration who need much greater light to see. These paths must also not become the domain of those such as skateboarders, especially at the oval in on a slope making such paths a natural attraction for these groups. Additional lighting, whilst vital, presents a potential problem for those properties whose gardens or frontages adjoin the perimeter. Therefore, consideration will need to be given to the type, and height of any lighting. Partnerships should be developed with organisations and disabled charities to discuss how these paths may be designed in order that they are as inclusive as possible and do not present a bar to specific groups.</p>	Noted, will be included in the Parish Initiatives
Resident 81	The NPPF should be complied with in relation to our local green spaces and any future developments.	The NPPF criteria has been used.
Resident 82	These are valuable and valued local spaces even where they are not publicly accessible and should be protected. This is not to say that improvements to community facilities on, for example, the Oval aren't important. Their location and design will need to enhance the space and increase its value to local residents.	Noted
Resident 83	What about inclusion of the Bowls Club?	This area not included in the LGS designation (as this would restrict any future enhancements) Plan will be amended to clarify
Resident 84	Enhanced public access to the Water Garden should be investigated, together with incentives for the current owners to maintain it in improved condition.	LGS4 The Water Gardens is private land with no public access. The designation will be removed due to the restrictions it would impose on Permitted Development

RCC Comments	LGS 2: The Oval is identified as an important open space & frontage in the Local Plan, Policy SP21 and is considered Green Infrastructure and is safeguarded under Policy CS23 of the Core Strategy.	Local Green Space designation would prevent development in most instances. On consideration the existing local plan policy is a better form of recognition. The designation proposal will be removed
--------------	--	--

Policy NL7 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 4	This is for the general good and for sustainability and for the planet. Can we re-focus the thinking also to consider the benefits that could be created for locals.	The neighbourhood plan applies to the neighbourhood area.
Resident 16	Any development must not increase the risk of flooding from surface water or watercourses or any other source of flooding such as from rivers, groundwater and reservoirs.	Noted. Covered by this policy.
Resident 25	NO COMMENT	
Resident 38	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks.</p> <p>The DIO agree that development should have no overall adverse impact on watercourses, should incorporate sustainable urban drainage and incorporate permeable materials as part of the design.</p>	Noted
Resident 63	Water quality, surface drainage and sewage management are all important, and this policy should help to ensure any future development does not have a negative impact on the water / sewage management in the Parish	Noted
Resident 66	NO BUILDING WHATSOEVER ON FLOOD PLAINS.	Noted. Covered under the planning process
Resident 74	<p>Given the problems associated with parking in the village there is a temptation to remove lawned frontages from properties and create "hardstanding" driveways for off road parking. This can lead to loss of natural soakaways and excess surface water. This needs to be prevented. The comment in 2 is not sufficient to address this as the comment seems to accept that there may well be additional flow rates created. Whilst 1 may attempt to address the problem many may not consider digging up their front lawn as "development".</p> <p>New developments must have this included as a compulsory part of the development. Looking at the three houses developed in Glebe Road it would appear that they have block paved frontages set on a steep slope, as opposed to "soakaway" permeable materials. This type of arrangement should be resisted if this Policy is to be realised.</p>	Any development that potentially leads to additional run off is reviewed and managed via the planning process

Resident 79	<p>Given the pressures being generated by climate change, and specifically the change in flood risk caused by changes in rainfall patterns, I believe this section should also contain a policy in support of development proposals for natural flood management measures within the parish (see here: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/natural-flood-management-part-of-the-nations-flood-resilience for an explanation of this issue).</p> <p>Given the dire state of the River Chater (as explained in the NP) it is disappointing not to see a policy supporting development proposals that seek to improve the river's health and water quality.</p>	<p>The policy addresses flood risk, but can't go into excessive or prescriptive detail and there is no point in repeating national guidance (see plan document for references to National Guidance)</p>
RCC Comments	<p>The use of 'must' suggest 'development will be supported where there will be no overall adverse impact' or should this be 'significant'?What is considered adverse/significant?</p>	<p>Change Clause 1 from 'Must' to 'Should'. Change 'overall' to 'significant' in Clause 1.</p>

Policy NL8 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 13	My view is that these design issues could, and perhaps should, be taken further in the light of the current need to minimise energy use. Thought needs to be given to electric car charging points for each property. To the extent that top quality loft and cavity wall insulation is not already covered in building regulations, that should be an added requirement. And could there be a requirement for solar panels on each building (or better, solar roof tiles)?	The plan can't be prescriptive on solar panels, but they are encouraged in the interpretation. Electric charging points are already included in policy NL11 clause 4. Policy can't deal with loft insulation.
Resident 16	In points 1,3,4,5,9,10,12,13,14 replace 'should' with 'must'. Point 12 - it may not be appropriate to include a building made of limestone and Collyweston slate in the 1960, 1970 etc streets. It may be more appropriate to be of the period of the street. I think it would be appropriate for a brand-new development like SGB to have limestone and Collyweston slate buildings though. Point 15 - 'will' is too strong because innovative or creative solutions may not always be in keeping with the area.	Previous examinations suggest that "should" works better than "must" in terms of compliance with national policy. The policy is flexible as worded.
Resident 22	Sustainability is vital new developments and existing should have solar or other options available	The interpretation lists green design elements.
Resident 23	Just because a green design is used does not mean that the design would suit the local character. Green design could become a greenwash. Housing design needs to blend with local area existing housing stock. The barn conversion at the settings at present looks like an office block, I hope this will improve on completion, it doesn't blend in with the existing housing at that site.	Noted. Sensible application of design requirements will be through the planning process
Resident 25	NO CYCLEWAYS NEEDED. NORTH LUFFENHAM IS NOT A VELODROME. CYCLISTS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO 10mph AND BE A MEANS OF GETTING FROM PLACE TO PLACE, NOT TO RACE ANYWHERE	The plan encourages sustainable and active travel options such as cycling. Cycle paths, where supported by evidence, are intended to ensure safety of cyclists and pedestrians.
Resident 32	I can't disagree with any of the above policies, how practical they are to impose in terms of the viability of any project I would question.	The NLPC Planning Committee will be scrutinising each application in detail and challenging when necessary,

Resident 34	<p>any new development should as a minimum have pedestrian access pointing towards centre of the village. This is a fundamental flaw of the Ancaster way development - whether on foot, bike or car the only way out points to outside of village. (Both Newmans close and Edith Weston Rd). This could lead to less engagement in village activities from those communities.</p> <p>All new properties should be completely green design and have much higher than standard insulation and solar roof panels as minimum. We have some of the the least green housing stock in Europe - this needs to change.</p>	Comments noted. Pedestrian permeability and connectivity in the policy and NL11. Green design elements are included in the interpretation.
Resident 38	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks. Policy NL8 provides detail on development type, building heights, mix, local character, reduction in carbon, amenity space, green infrastructure and inclusive design. The DIO are broadly supportive of all elements of Policy NL8 and encourage such a policy which will enhance the quality of future spaces in the village and broader borough area. The pre and post-text to the Policy refers to the SGB Masterplan and Design Code document, as prepared by the Parish in consultation with professional advisors. However, there is no specific reference in the Policy to this document, and hence it would currently be given limited weight, if development proposals do come forward on the St George's Barracks land. The DIO would suggest that St George's should be identified as a specific Policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, as set out later in this representation.</p>	Neighbourhood Plan wording will be updated to strengthen the existing reference to the Masterplan and Design Code documents. At present St Georges Barracks has no specific status in the existing Local Plan, and the North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan did not assign any sites for development and therefore a specific policy for SGB is not considered appropriate.
Resident 42	Just sensible, reasonable developments in accordance with existing Planning guidelines	Noted
Resident 44	Each site should be judged on its own merits	Noted

Resident 47	<p>This policy should include or be adjusted to include:</p> <p>a) Any new developments should be located close to the existing village, new developments should not be a "Satellite" to the existing village. New developments should be physically integrated into the existing village without "gap filling".</p> <p>b) Any public access such as "Byways" that were once removed for SGB during WW2 (if applicable) should be reinstated as part of any new development, the existence of historic public access should be investigated and reported back to the Parish prior to any new development in that area.</p> <p>c) No new development housing should exceed 2 stories keeping in line with past modern developments such as "Ancaster Way".</p>	Policies NL1 and NL3 sets out where development will be supported. NL4 sets constraints on certain landscape areas.
Resident 49	Strongly agree with priority for pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted
Resident 54	Aiming high but this is how to prioritise quality in the rural environment	Noted
Resident 56	Buildings must be kept in keeping with what is already in place in our beautiful village	Noted
Resident 62	This is a very well measured policy to balance the demands for new building with retention of the village character, and the use of modern carbon friendly materials. It should potentially be made clearer to not exclude the use of modern facsimiles of traditional materials, to enable retention of the village character with improved environmental performance at reasonable expense.	Interpretation will be updated to cover facsimile materials
Resident 64	Should also be a ban on the use of fake and plastic grass	The plan can't do this.
Resident 65	PREFER NOT TO HAVE BALCONIES.	Noted
Resident 69	All new housing should have solar panels on roof space and roofs should be orientated to get maximum gain.	The plan can't be prescriptive on solar panels, but they are encouraged in the interpretation.

	<p>Item 2: See earlier comment on trees</p> <p>Item 6: Please see earlier comments in NL 1 around footpaths and disabled access.</p> <p>Item 7: The existing planning line should always be observed. This has patently been ignored with the Glebe Road development where at least one existing property has been adversely affected by the frontage of the new development being brought almost to the road edge. Such an event could easily lead to other properties in that row wishing to do the same due to the precedent set, which would fundamentally alter the vista of that part of the road. Therefore, in order to assure the same does not happen elsewhere it is important to ensure that the existing frontage line is observed in all development and this needs to be clear.</p> <p>Item 9: This is open to interpretation as it is worded. When it states, "Housing should use different styles, materials, heights and orientations to complement the existing character of the area" the sentence does not preclude the use of, and building material for example stainless steel, or aluminium, pre-cast concrete etc. (one viewing of Grand Designs will demonstrate how an architect could view "complementing the existing character of the area"!)</p> <p>If it is meant that housing should make full use of materials such as "currently have been used in existing housing" then that avoids the whims of an architect's design fancy, which can, and often is, varied and "original!"</p> <p>Item 10: I agree with the sentiments here but what exactly is meant by "private garden space?" Does a four-foot square paved courtyard suffice on a new five-bedroom house? It would help to understand what is being sought in this statement. Would it help to say the space should be commensurate with the size of the house?</p> <p>Item 15: This statement is an architect's dream statement because it says that however whacky their innovative creative design is it will be supported! Grand designs could well be filming in North Luffenham before long!</p>	<p>Item 2: Not clear what comment this relates to. Note trees are also dealt with in Policy NL4. Item 6: Not clear what comment this relates to. Policy NL11, clause 3 deals with accessibility. Item 7: The policy already addresses set back from the road. Item 9: The character is based on architectural diversity. Item 10: Setting minimum areas for gardens tends to create generic 'anywhere' design, whereas the neighbourhood plan promotes locally distinctive design. Item 15: The neighbourhood plan does set design requirements but is careful to avoid suppression of creativity or green design.</p>
Resident 73		
Resident 80	The need to implement all of the above points will need specialist input.	Noted
Resident 81	The unique character of our village needs to be preserved as it develops. This policy does just that.	Noted

Resident 82	Recent planning approvals on Glebe Road have contemplated housing density which is too high to be compatible with the local character, in my view. New approvals should require much more substantial garden space around dwelling, and more substantial setbacks between dwellings. Exception might be made for affordable housing developments of modest scale, provided the design was inspired and plenty of green space is included in the design.	Will be addressed through the planning process
RCC Comments	Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Now referred to as "Design Guidelines for Rutland". Clause 6 Use of 'must', can this be required? Clause 8 does this mean development should complement existing buildings adjacent to a proposal? Not clear how this would be considered. Clause 9 Include 'surrounding' Clause 10 Does this mean all dwellings should have balconies? Clause 11 Use of 'must' Clause 12 Include where possible? Define high-quality. Interpretation Delete reference to South Kesteven	Will be updated. 'must' to be changed to 'should' in clause 6 and 7. Clause 8 This would be an urban design judgement based on the local context. This would include consideration of adjoining sites and the wider area. Clause 9 Change to "Surrounding Area" Clause 10 re-draft clause 10 to now read: 'All dwellings should have private or shared garden space'. Clause 11 change 'must' to 'should' Clause 12 No policy change. In the interpretation before the paragraph on Green Materials' in considering whether materials are high-quality, relevant factors would include durability and standards of detail and finish.' will be added Interpretation Will be updated

Policy NL9 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 16	I think it is appropriate to use limestone and slate for infill and extensions to existing buildings that already are in this style but I don't think it would be appropriate for 1960, 1970 houses to have an extension made of limestone and Collyweston slate.	Noted
Resident 26	SOME VARIATION SHOULD BE PERMITTED OTHERWISE WE WOULD ALL REMAIN IN THE DARK AGES, WITH LOW CEILINGS AND NO WINDOWS	Noted
Resident 29	For financial reasons, good quality "look alike materials" e.g. 'mock' Collyweston tiles should not be excluded in building materials	Interpretation will be updated to cover facsimile materials
Resident 33	Again I am in agreement in principle however there are instances where the viability of restoring discussed building's is not financially practical using original materials. Example : the cost to replace the Collyweston roof on the old toilet block at The Fox to create a useable space.	Interpretation will be updated to cover facsimile materials
Resident 39	Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks. The DIO agree that development should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the North Luffenham Conservation Area, and designated and non-designated heritage assets, to avoid the loss of architectural features.	Noted
Resident 54		
Resident 55	Heritage preservation is the key to contemporary living quality of the environment .. must be supported	Noted
Resident 57	Any new houses should be built in such a way as to not change the appearance of our historic village. Such an old and historic settlement should not be changed by building modern new ugly homes.	Noted
Resident 63	The Conservation area defines the architectural character of the village, and this policy protects and clarifies development limitations within it.	Noted

Resident 74	There is an opportunity to enhance North Luffenham with more information boards. This was particularly picked up on during the Platinum Jubilee Celebrations when the "Horseshoe Hunt" took place. Many people took the opportunity to walk round the village reading the signs that had been put up about various historical buildings as well as taking the guided tour around with them. Many commented on how little they actually knew of the village. I also met an industrial archaeologist who lives in the village and he told me of just how much of the robbed out remains of the original North Luffenham Hall exist in current buildings in the Village, some of which can be found in my own garden! Use of information boards around the village would be a great opportunity to enhance awareness of the historic environment of the village.	Noted and will be included in Parish Initiatives
Resident 77	The environment evolves over time so some old some new	Noted
Resident 82	To ensure any changes are in line with NPPF.	Noted
Resident 83	The village has many unique features and some interesting history, but I suspect many villagers are unaware. I support the policy and think we need to "point out" and explain some of this more. than we. currently do,	Noted
Resident 84	I strongly support retention of any historic stone walls without exception. Condition 2 above must be rigorously applied.	Noted

Policy NL10 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 1	and South Luffenham	South Luffenham is outside of the Neighbourhood Plan area
Resident 25	NO COMMENT	
Resident 38	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks.</p> <p>The DIO agree that development should not harm the protected landscape and important green spaces. The policy should reflect that the St George's Barracks site is previously developed land and ensure that this is appropriately assessed as part of any future development.</p>	Noted. Will be addressed through the planning process. RCC and the DIO always state SGB is a brownfield site but the NPPF states that not all of a brownfield site may be suitable for development.
Resident 42	No linear developments N. Luff - E. Weston (No underlined and arrow between N. Luff and E. Weston)	Noted
Resident 54	The Green setting of NL is of great significant value	Noted
Resident 55	Crucial part of the plan to avoid infill.	Noted
Resident 56	This is absolutely VITAL.	Noted
Resident 62	The rural setting of the village is one of the defining characteristics of North Luffenham village, and this should be protected	Noted
Resident 65	VERY IMPORTANT THIS IS ADHERED TO.	Noted
Resident 73	<p>Whilst "highly approving" and understanding the reasons why this separation is important to maintain, it is also important to realise that EW is our nearest place for a village shop and post office. Hence, whilst maintaining that space it is also very important to ensure that we do not, cut off the two villages from each other. Currently the only link is by road and a narrow pavement. Consideration needs to be given to creation of cycle routes to connect the two villages. This is in keeping with the aim of NL10 whilst also aligning with other features within the plan.</p>	Noted
Resident 81	The setting of the village is very important and, amongst other things, showcases the village's farming communities and context.	Noted
Resident 82	Let us maintain a strong and vibrant Green interval between N Luffenham and any proposed development on the St George's Barracks site.	Noted

Resident 83	Separation from Edith Weston is the Army land at present BUT something (underlined) must be done with it	Noted. Development proposals will come forward through the planning process
RCC Comments	This policy doesn't preclude development. Development may still come forward if it's in accordance with policy SP6 and SP7 Delete SK from the design guidelines	The policy clearly has implications for how policies SP6 and SP7 are applied. The reason for including this policy is to aid consistent application of SP6 and SP7 Will be updated

Policy NL11 Comments

Resident	Residents Comments	NLPC Comments
Resident 9	Overall, I agree with of point 2. I do not agree that anyone building a house needs to include a bike store. North Luffenham is not a particularly bike friendly place (I appreciate bikes are used for leisure but unlikely to be used for commuting etc).	Noted
Resident 16	Points 1,3,4,5, - replace all 'should' with 'must'. Point 9 - parking provision must not be street parking. Dropped kerbs at convenient places in footpaths should be included to allow wheelchair and scooter users to crossroads safely or access green and open spaces.	Previous examinations have suggested that use of "should" is more in line with national policy. The policy does not preclude street parking but does require a mixed provision. Policy already mentions mobility (and the plan includes the "Access For All" document)
Resident 20	Charge points for electric vehicles should be added to every space - not just a few	Noted. For development through planning process
Resident 25	POINTS 2, 4 & 5 ARE RIDICULOUS BECAUSE THEY ENCOURAGE VANDALISM. CYCLES & ELECTRIC CHARGING POINTS SHOULD ONLY BE AT EACH PROPERTY NOT IN A COMMUNAL AREA. HISTORY SUPPORTS THIS AROUND TH U.K.	Noted The contra-view has been expressed by a number of residents.
Resident 26	THIS IS A VERY GOOD POLICY	Noted
Resident 34	street parking should not be allowed from a practical, safety and aesthetic point of view.	Noted
Resident 38	<p>Comment provided on behalf of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect of their land interests at St George's Barracks.</p> <p>The DIO agree that new development should be appropriately planned to incorporate a range of transport modes, including accessible and active travel. The integration of charging points for electric vehicles, secure cycle storage and safe pedestrian routes are all supported.</p> <p>Highways infrastructure improvements should be determined through appropriate assessment, to ensure the most efficient access for existing and future occupiers.</p>	Noted

Resident 42	(This was written on the form following the Basic Condition Statement) <u>COMMENT</u> (underlined) Plans for SGB could overwhelm all. Replacing the barracks area with a smaller development (e.g. the 400 houses on the LHS/A1 side beyond Tinwell on the edge of Stamford) may be reasonable. Check out on internet: " <u>House of Commons Report - MOD Disposal Database</u> " (between inverted commas underlined). Out of 142 sites listed across the UK, Rutland's SGB has been ranked in its 'Housing Unit Potential' (2,215) as second (underlined) only to Abingdon (2,750)! This, the smallest county, right next to Rutland Water....	Noted
Resident 45	Parking will always be a problem in what was originally where few if any had cars. I have parked my car between garage and barn, in fact our property, & no problem for years, but originally had some, thinking it public space.	Noted
Resident 47	This policy should be modified or adjusted to include: a) Any new developments should involve the re-reinstatement of the "Luffenham" Railway station providing rail access routes to Oakham, Stamford and Corby. The station should have suitable access by footpaths and cycle routes. b) New developments should provide enough off road parking within their boundaries for 3 cars per dwelling. (2 cars per home plus 1 visiting car). This would remove the need for cars to be parked on the roads. c) New developments should include a dedicated parking/storage area for residents who need to park or store business or commercial vehicles at their homes.	Luffenham Railway Station is not within the scope of the NP. Refer to the Design Code documents for information on the other matters.
Resident 49	Should include public transport. How are you going to get people out of their cars without public transport. What about older people who are no longer able to drive.	Noted and will be covered under Parish Initiatives
Resident 54	These statements are clear and obvious for a modern and caring community	Noted
Resident 56	Highway infrastructure should take into account the rising amount of speeding that goes on. It should include provision for tackling the speeding problem.	Noted Not within the scope of the NP - to be included in Parish Initiatives
Resident 62	Currently 99% of journeys from the village are car based. Anything to reduce this will be an improvement. Increased priority for pedestrians and cycles is to be welcomed. Unfortunately, bus and train services are outside of the scope of this Plan. Improvements in these would be welcomed by all residents in North Luffenham	Noted

Resident 65	APPROVE. HOWEVER, PARKING AND GARAGE USE FOR CARS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED. STREET PARKING SHOULD BE THE LAST RESORT.	Noted
Resident 66	STREET PARKING SHOULD NOT BE ENCOURAGED IT CAN CAUSE HAZARDS	Noted
Resident 73	<p>Item 1: All new development should actively lean towards transport that is not reliant on existing internal combustion engines. Whilst not always practical this must be the stated aim in order to create a clean environment. Item 3: Very good to see this but it should be extended to civic facilities also so that charging may take place whilst attending events. Item 4: This fits with earlier comments on additional parking space at a new village hall. No mention is made of controlling pollution levels. North Luffenham is not alone in having a defined "centre" to the village. Often in these areas, at times of high usage, vehicle congestion can result in pollution spikes well in excess of stated maximum levels. I feel it is important to note in any plan that these potential areas of pollution spikes will be assessed and if in breach solutions will be sought. There is one very obvious site central to the village where this may already occur. If this is the case, it is contra to everything that is laid out in the Plan in terms of healthy living etc. so this is a fundamental to the health of villagers. Consideration should be given to where cars are parked and ways to alleviate this if there is a problem, for instance creating parking away from the central area (for example a village hall car park on the periphery) and then walking to the centre of the village.) Whilst it may be the responsibility of the Highways Department there can be no denying that some of the roads within the village and on its borders are in an appalling state. Many shows signs of subsidence and serious surface degradation with potholing. This is only going to worsen with further neglect. Any developments within the village must take into account the state of the roads. Currently, it is only a matter of time before someone, quite possibly a cyclist, swerves to avoid a pothole or is thrown by a fallen edge of the road and ends up with either a collision with another vehicle, or a pedestrian, resulting in a serious incident. I would suggest that there needs to be somewhere a comment that highways infrastructure must be maintained adequately, and that development may need to be restricted if highways infrastructure is deemed unsuitable.</p>	Noted Whilst these suggestions are outwith the scope of the NP they will be included in the Parish Initiatives
Resident 80	There should be a clearer accountability for Public Transport	Noted

Resident 81	A shift to more sustainable forms of travel, such as increased and better promoted bus services, is important and will reduce traffic. Cycling and walking should also be encouraged by making roads and pavements as safe and accessible as possible for all.	Noted
Resident 84	We don't think that parking areas will need EV charging facilities, as people who live here will likely have their own charge points if needed.	Noted. Availability of charge points promotes electric vehicles
RCC Comments	<p>Clause 1 How will this be considered as part of a planning application?</p> <p>Clause 2 The use of 'must', can this be required?</p> <p>Clause 3 Can this be required?</p> <p>Clause 4 How will this be implemented? Will this be for each dwelling?</p> <p>Clause 5 Is this referring to the layout of the development?</p> <p>Clause 6 How will this be considered as part of a planning application?</p> <p>Clause 7 Use of 'must'</p>	<p>Clause 1, 'following' before 'requirements of this policy..', will be added</p> <p>Clause 2 No change.</p> <p>Clause 3 No change</p> <p>Clause 4, 'including for each dwelling..' will be added to clause 4</p> <p>Clause 5 Clause 5 will be updated to add at the end: 'in the design and layout of development.'</p> <p>Clause 6 The planning application would include details on the traffic generated, allowing an informed judgement to be made.</p> <p>Clause 7 Change 'must' to 'should'.</p>

- = END OF DOCUMENT = -