

EARLS BARTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT APPENDIX 12

June 2014





Earls Barton Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-Submission (Reg 14) consultation – Table of public comments and responses					
Policy Ref.	Response Ref.	Name (organisation) of respondent	Comments	Response by EBNPSG	Suggested changes to the Draft NP
6.1 Village Boundary	PC1	Mr Coulton	We have noticed that New Lodge and New Lodge Vineyard are not included in the village boundary plan on page 14.	Include properties within the village boundary	Include New Lodge and New Lodge Vineyard property within the boundary line but exclude the extended garden area and vineyard due to 6.1 (d).
	PC2				
	PC3				
6.1 Village Boundary 6.2 The Grange Allocation 6.3 Windfall sites 6.4 Environment & Design	PC4	Mr Haining	<p>Could expand to the A45</p> <p>In tandem with business like the Co-op & library need freedom to expand and cope with 20% more people throughput</p> <p>Proportion of low cost/social housing should not alter the current % mix</p> <p>Restrict the blight of visible solar panels & satellite dishes</p>	<p>The preferred direction of growth is to the north.</p> <p>Policy EB.LB1 will allow for sustainable growth of local services</p> <p>Policy EB.GD1 reinforces the % mix provided for in the Development Plan</p> <p>Solar panels & satellite dishes in general have permitted</p>	No Changes Required

6.6 Local Business			Need offices as well as factory/storage units & good broadband	development rights Policy EB.E1 & E2 will support office development.	
6.7 Employment			Jobs are more important than parking	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Don't want restrictions. Fix the lights (traffic) on A4500/Mears Ashby Road – tailbacks worse since recent changes	Application 13/0510/OUT will require transport measures on the A4500 to mitigate development impact	
6.9 Developer contributions			Unethical	Noted	
	PC5				
	PC6				
General	PC7	No Name	Do not need any expansion at all. The school, surgeries, parking etc can only just cope at the minute	Housing Needs Survey demonstrates a need for min. of 256 dwellings for Earls Barton to 2031	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business	PC8	No Name	Retail – where would additional retail premises be located as all available space in the village centre has been designated for housing i.e. the Dance Studio, Bowlers Yard	Over time premises may become available and if within the village centre boundary retail and business uses are likely to be supported.	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			1.5 cars is inadequate parking spaces for such a large development	This is the standard required by the Highway Authority	
6.9 Developer contributions			Believe more facilities could have been negotiated with the developers than have been agreed.	Only contributions which are CIL compliant can be requested and that are viable for the development	
	PC9				
6.6 Local Business	PC10	No Name	No reference to toilet facilities. May be shops and businesses but they are not going to provide a public facility such as this. What will be done about it?	Toilet facilities would be a decision for the Parish Council and is not necessarily a NP issue. Provision of public toilets likely to occur with community facilities at the Grange.	No Changes Required

6.8 Transport & Parking			Parking in the village is a serious problem and getting worse	Noted. The NP attempts to address this in some degree.	
6.9 Developer contributions			Could developers provide public toilet facilities as referred to in 6.6	Contributions for public toilets would need to be CIL compliant. Provision alongside sports changing rooms likely to take place.	
	PC11				
	PC12				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC13	No Name	It appears the boundary has extended to meet the new proposed development. Access on to A4500 between 8-9am is difficult with some days queues for 5-10mins at traffic lights to travel ½ mile.	New village boundary line will include Grange allocated site. Traffic impact assessment from application will provide mitigation measures for increased traffic issues	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			How would this improve quality of life? The access is onto an already stretched road with several accidents at the A4500/Wellingborough Rd junction.	The direct access onto A4500 is considered preferable to all development traffic having to go through the centre of the village.	
6.3 Windfall sites			Houses for an aging population are also required. Bungalows for example and retirement flats.	Noted. Can be provided for in allocated site and on windfall sites	
6.4 Environment & Design			As long as all new sites are inspected for SSSI	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Although some are being lost for 280 houses off A4500.	Grange Site is providing more Sports and Leisure and open space not less	
6.6 Local Business			Vacant buildings need to be used first. Many at Mallard Close are empty or partially used.	Agreed – but not a substantial level of vacant premises available.	

6.7 Employment			There is insufficient parking for more employment.	This would need to be provided for as part of any new development.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Parking in the village centre is an issue	Noted.	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC14	No Name	Ridiculous question. This answer could be both ways? In what context?		No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			As long as there is shops etc	Shops are not part of the Grange allocation, these are more preferable within the village centre	
6.3 Windfall sites			As long as traffic is eased going through village and not extra traffic south of village/Station Rd.	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Include land behind Station Road/Allebone Rd to rear of Dowthorpe Hill	New open space needs to perform a function. This would not therefore cannot designate as open space.	
6.6 Local business			Where are new shops to accommodate new houses	Policy EB.LB1 will allow for additional retail if demand is there.	
6.7 Employment			As long as not south of village or in village centre	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Extension of cycle route to Northampton from Earls Barton as no connection from Station Rd to Billing Aquadrome	This does not form part of the plan proposals however other agencies looking at strategic cycle network and necessary linkages	
6.9 Developer contributions			Need sports indoor centre, gym, sports hall which can be used for all indoor sports such as squash,	Contributions secured for changing facilities for sports however expansion area possible for indoor	

			badminton, judo etc 5-a-side football, cricket etc	sports/community hall if funding can be secured.	
	PC15				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC16	Mr A Green	Is there a way we can control industrial & warehousing development so that land between Sunnyside & A45 does not become industrial?	This land is not allocated for employment of residential development.	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			Essential that we encourage more local business & specifically small companies & sole traders. They contribute to the wealth of the village & tend to be more environmentally efficient.	Policies EB.LB1/E1 & E2 will help to provide opportunities for small businesses to trade and obtain premises.	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC17	No Name	Yes agree – but please ensure that Earls Barton keeps to being a large village and not expand so much it becomes a town – i.e. keep housing expansion to a minimum	Noted	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Yes – but a lot of the ‘green’ of the village has already been built on – this should be the last.	Noted	
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC18	Mr C Dicken	Hard to know what the thinking is here. It seems to allow development anywhere in the village – even if all criteria aren’t met.	Development would be required to meet criteria but if former uses are no longer viable then other uses may be appropriate.	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Space			It would appear that on the corner of Fairhurst Way/Churchill Rd has been re-designated. In the Wellingborough Plan, it is classed as ‘environmentally important open space’ – this is missing from the Earls Barton plan. Is this a	The site is allocated as EIOS in the saved policies of the Local Plan. The Preferred option (Oct2010) allocates this area for housing. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation did not raise major issues about	

6.9 Developer contributions			<p>way of allowing the applied for planning permission?</p> <p>How will additional car parking be provided in the village centre?</p>	<p>retaining this area as open space and other areas have been allocated which will compensate for this loss.</p> <p>Policy EB.T1 will assist in reducing parking pressure on the village centre however no plans are currently in place for further parking. If sites become available developer contributions could assist in delivering further parking and some options are being considered by the Parish Council</p>	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC19	Ms E Catlin	<p>As long as it does respect the privacy of existing residents adjacent to the area and avoids building which infringes on their privacy</p>	<p>Reserve Matter applications will set out the detailed design issues – Policy EB.G1 will help to ensure the protection of existing resident’s amenity.</p> <p>Noted</p>	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites			<p>As long as this doesn’t adversely impact on parking, access, light or character of the existing area.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>Parking and safety of pedestrians is an important issues and continues to problematic in all the areas outlined.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
	PC20				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC21	No Name	<p>What about a Bowls Green?</p>	<p>The detailed design and layout of sports pitches and facilities is being undertaken with consultant’s advice and a Reserve Matter application will identify the provision. At the present time it is not financially or physically viable to include bowls within the proposals. However, this has not been precluded for the future.</p>	No Changes Required

	PC22				
6.6 Local Business	PC23	No Name	<p>Whole heartedly agree with encouraging businesses such as delicatessens, bistros, restaurants etc – currently sadly lacking and resulting in having to leave the village to socialise</p> <p>I would prefer employment to come from retail shops and facilities such as restaurants rather than developing business centres.</p> <p>I cannot see how the parking situation has/will be improved. People should have parking facilities in the centre of village if we are able to use the shops. There are currently not enough parking spaces anywhere so parking restrictions will make things worse.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Parking facilities exist on the village square and parking controls may improve the turnover of parking for shoppers. Additional parking is difficult to provide unless land is controlled. Some options are being considered by the Parish Council which may increase parking at the north side of the Recreation Ground.</p>	No Changes Required
6.7 Employment					
6.8 Transport & Parking					
6.6 Local Business	PC24	Mr J Chapman	<p>One should do all one possibly can to encourage new business and local employment</p> <p>I still fail to see any concrete proposals for improving parking in the centre of the village. This is vital to keep the village centre and its facilities and services, businesses and retailers alive, thriving and hopefully augmented and the population increases.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>See response in PC23</p>	
6.8 Transport & Parking					

6.9 Developer Contributions			We should aim to get as much as possible, not just the legal minimum requirements from speculative developers.	Contributions from developers all need to be CIL compliant and justified	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC25	Ms E Moore	As long as there will be no limited time on parking in the village for residents – close to their homes. Traffic to and from schools is the most congested time. Fully support more pedestrian walkways but will they be used?	The Parish Council has been considering parking controls and time limits for parking on the square to improve parking turnover for shoppers. Note the concern about parking for residential areas. Further pedestrian and cycleways will make parts of the village more accessible.	No Changes Required
	PC26				
General	PC27	Mr Farmer	Note – Industrial Estate Road via A4500 speed restrictions needed. 30 mph & weight limit for lorries? 7.5 ton.	There is currently a 30 mph speed limit as you enter the village on Wellingborough Road. Further speed restrictions are likely to slow traffic in front of the proposed new entrances to the new development on the A4500. A weight limit for lorries does not seem necessary as the entrance for the industrial estate is before any major housing area is reached.	No Changes Required
	PC28				
6.5 Open Space	PC29	Ms S Dennis	Have you thought about registering these assets of community value under the Localism Act/Town Village Greens, if not already?	The designation of Local Green Space will provide protection for these open spaces. None have been designated as village greens. It was considered that designation of Local Green Space was a better provision for open space than registering them as Assets of Community Value.	No Changes Required

6.3 Windfall Sites	PC30	Clarke Family	As long as it is within village boundary as it is now	Noted	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Spaces			Should include land between Dowthorpe Hill, Station Road, Mill Lane and A45. Also land bordering Northampton Road on Ecton side.	See response in PC14 6.5	
	PC31				
	PC32				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC33	Mrs Blundell	As long as the housing built meets the needs of the village i.e. more 2/3 bedroom houses	Noted	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Space			These are the lungs of the village	Noted	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC34	No Name	Fully agree with the village boundary as shown. However, what 'status' will future residents of the site behind Compton Way have? Will they be village residents if their properties are outside the boundary as shown on the map?	Noted. Village boundary currently excludes areas of land with planning permission which are adjacent to the main built up area by provision of 6.1F. If developments are built then boundary line will be reviewed and amended at that time.	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Space			Agree that the green space within the village should be protected, but the majority is not accessible for everyone to benefit. The only true green <u>public</u> space is the rec. and the pocket park. More areas need to be reallocated (purchased) as public general green space.	Noted. Further land at the Grange is to be transferred in to public control for sports and leisure facilities and also general public open space. It is also important to safeguard other open space that would affect resident's amenity should this be developed on in the future.	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC35	No Name	Although I agree with this I am concerned that other sports are not included [bowls club, hockey]	See response in PC21 6.2	No Changes Required
6.7 Employment			This section is a good idea.	Noted	

6.8 Transport & Parking			Concerned that the whole of Station Road is not considered to require a Constrained Access. This area is a bottle neck when bowls club has a tournament.	The majority of Station Road is covered by this policy especially the area mentioned around the access to the bowls club.	
	PC36				
	PC37				
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC38	No Name	So long as proper consideration is given to traffic generation. The Station Road & Thorpe Road applications gave little consideration to the issues of volume of traffic & parking in Station Road.	Noted	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			Parking will be key issue as likely new businesses will be close to or directly in village centre where parking is already a major problem.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Both are major problems across the village & have to take priority.	Noted	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC39	No Name	Believe that this area serves as a communal sports area with wonderful firework displays and celebrations for the whole village benefit and these of surrounding villages.	Noted. This should be safeguarded for the future.	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites			Limited building/housing only. Keep our village a village!	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Keep as much open space as possible for our children, animals and welfare.	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Please create a small village centre office complex for business growth	Office development will not be precluded from taking place in the	

6.8 Transport & Parking			and provide more shop space to retain residents. Major issue for E.B. and needs properly addressing through the plan.	village centre however it will depend on demand and availability of sites/premises. Noted	
6.5 Open Space General	PC40	No Name	What about a specific dog field instead of using a child's play park to run dogs. Parish Council have done nothing. In relation to the above, all of the above, the Council & builder are not concerned with our views, it's about money for both of them. Please note: Objections have been made about the dog poo & dogs off leads – ignored by P. Council. Objections raised to a hairdresser running a business from home, causing a pain for people to park and safety issue – ignored by Council.	This is more of a management issue and not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan. It could be addressed in a variety of ways and better dog fouling controls is one mechanism. See comments above	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC41	No Name	Affordable housing should be a high priority	This is addressed in the plan through Policies EB.G1/GD1/GD2	No Changes Required
	PC42				
	PC43				
	PC44				
General	PC45	No Name	No development in our village	A minimum of 256 dwellings has been identified as being required to meet the local needs of the village up to 2031	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC46	No Name	No.280 houses is far too many. We can't take them back once built. No more than 100. If after these have been occupied for a while and the infrastructure copes then consider what else to build. Houses should be	Noted – See Response in PC45	No Changes Required

6.3 Windfall Sites			<p>small & affordable not 'executive' large homes - 3 bed and smaller.</p> <p>Don't know what windfall is. You need to explain the term for me to agree. It is obviously a planning term.</p>	<p>Windfall sites are those that come forward over the plan period that have not been allocated but are within the village boundary. The current proposals for housing on the Butchers Yard is an example.</p>	
6.4 Environment & Design			<p>Other than maybe keeping allotment space I had no objections to development adjacent to Compton Way. It seems an ideal area to develop. The one chosen now will be separate from the village, not a good thing I think could be 'them' and 'us'</p>	<p>The Grange site is considered to be preferable to those on Station Road in terms of the ability to meet the wider needs of the community with facilities and the amount of housing required. Proper integration with footpaths and access will be planned in.</p>	
6.5 Open Space			<p>Keep allotment space by all means but land by Compton Way seems ideal for building and believe had been earmarked for this possibility 30 years ago or so I have been told by residents.</p>	<p>Land at Compton Way has planning consent for 65 dwellings and therefore is likely to be built. It has not been previously allocated and this and other sites are not considered to be preferable for future growth.</p>	
6.6 Local Business			<p>We are the size of a town. If we are expanding we will need to be able to support more businesses/retail outlets. We really, really need a car park/parking management if we expand. People will drive to shops from Grange!</p>	<p>Noted. The plan seeks to provide for expanded retail and employment provision. Car parking management may assist in providing additional parking capacity in the village centre.</p>	

6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>People are lazy and think they have the right to park causing nuisance as 'they will only be a minute'. There needs to be more yellow lines/short term parking and most of all a car park! I agree with the areas you suggest as being of particular concern.</p>	Noted	
6.9 Developer Contributions			<p>Don't see why only football gets money. The majority of people who live here would not benefit at all, more people would benefit from improved/extra play areas or provision for a range of sports. A nice park area with flowers and seating, boules etc for older residents maybe.</p>	<p>Noted – See response in PC21. Land has been made available for a community/indoor sports hall which may be able to be provided in future if funding can be secured</p>	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC47	J. Wright	<p>Best for the village. Good road access and minimum impact on the crowded village centre. Sports and leisure facilities will enhance our community</p>	Noted	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer Contributions			<p>An excellent first draft! The NP should enable us to move forward whilst keeping the best of the 'old village'. Well done!</p>	Noted	
	PC48				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC49		<p>Access should be from A4500 only. With automatic bollards that raise for emergency vehicles on a route from the village centre. Therefore no increased traffic cutting through village & more exercise for children.</p>	<p>Noted. Emergency vehicles will need to access from A4500 as no vehicular access to be provided from Elizabeth Way/Pyghtle.</p>	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites			<p>The schools need to be enlarged or re-sited.</p>	<p>Option for school expansion are currently being explored.</p>	

6.4 Environment & Design			Can we have nicely designed homes, not just sustainable ones? Houses that look nice, not new builds from cheap red bricks and small windows. Estates with no paths e.g. Shoemakers Close – a housing disaster!	Design issues will be addressed at Reserve Matter application stage. Policy EB.D1 requires good design to be demonstrated against the North Northants Design Guidance.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Put pressure on local businesses to introduce car sharing schemes. A lot of in-village parking is taken up by workers who then moan there is no parking for customers. Urge schools to reward walkers, we all know there are some lazy people/parents who drive the kids to school. It's in the village centre, 10 mins from anywhere in E.B. Pedestrian/cycle only routes can be crime hotspots because it creates 'private' areas and an escape route for offenders to outwit police cars – this is a bad idea.	Many of these issues are being considered and implemented. The planning application for the Grange requires a Residential Travel Plan which covers a range of mechanisms to reduce the use of vehicles.	
General			New development should consult crime reduction trained police officers and architectural liaison trained police officers. Design out crime.	Noted. The police (architectural liaison officers) are consultees on applications within the Parish and Borough as a whole.	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC50	D. Corbett	Please try to limit parking on the 'little Green' car park (near chemist)	Parking management proposals are under consideration by the Parish Council	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer Contributions			Well done! A lot of hard work done on behalf of the village. Thank you.	Noted	
	PC51				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC52	L. Ridout	Very unclear – too much jargon and does not make sense.	Noted. The plan has been written in a style to help planning officers	No Changes Required

6.2 The Grange Allocation			Too many houses – Parking for village?	use the policies effectively when determining applications. See response in PC45. Some additional parking associated with the new sports development	
6.4 Environment & Design 6.5 Open Space			Needs to be in keeping with village style Need to save ALL green space.	Policy EB.D1 will assist in providing well designed new development. See response in PC14 6.5	
6.6 Local Business			Sounds ok	Noted	
6.7 Employment			Don't want industrial land to expand.	Further employment land will help to generate jobs and sustain the village.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Parking is already difficult and needs to be addressed now.	Noted. EB.T1 seek to minimise the impact of development for on-street residential parking	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Where would this actually be? Car parking in the village – community hall needs a revamp	See response in PC23 6.8. New/improved Community hall provision could be facilitated at the Grange.	
	PC53				
General	PC54	P. Henry	Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into this excellent Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC55	No Name	What about more bus shelters?	Further bus shelters and infrastructure may be required as part of planning obligations. A subsidised bus route to industrial areas in Northampton has been negotiated as part of the Grange application.	No Changes Required
	PC56				
	PC57				

6.8 Transport & Parking	PC58	No Name	The increase in population, especially if houses are located further away from the centre of the village can only increase parking problems in the centre.	The plan seeks to promote walking, cycling and buses over cars although it recognises that many people use this as a principal mode of transport. Better parking management will help to reduce parking pressure together with Policy EB.T1	No Changes Required
General	PC59	No Name	Agree with letter published in Barton Today – is the support for the Grange development the best option for the village?	Grange development assessed to be the preferred option for growth to accommodate minimum requirement of 256 dwellings and is community's preferred location for development.	No Changes Required
	PC60				
	PC61				
	PC62				
	PC63				
6.8 Transport & Parking 6.9 Developer Contributions	PC64	J. Shortland	Increasing local business opportunities should outweigh parking issues. Increase priority for young people's facilities to no. 4 and decrease parking to no.7	Noted The community facilities prioritised are done so but in no particular order.	No Changes Required
	PC65				
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC66	Wells	Better cycle paths should be sought when possible – connecting EB to W'boro and N'pton	Noted. See Response in PC14 6.8	No Changes Required
	PC67				
	PC68				
	PC69				
	PC70				
	PC71				

6.1 Village Boundary	PC72	No Name	Is this different to the current boundary? The plan doesn't say and if it is different should show current & NP boundary to enable comparison.	Main change to proposed village boundary line is the inclusion of the Grange development site. Current boundary is essential around the existing built up area.	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			There are enough takeaways & eateries (Jeyes/Coffee Shop/Stag/Swan) and don't need all of the other stuff – we need to stay a village!	Noted. Previous consultation has indicated that further services and facilities would be welcomed.	
6.7 Employment			Don't need it – there are so many empty offices, retail units & warehouses in Wellingborough – look at BCW investment property occupancy rates! Need to stay a village.	A certain level of additional employment land will help to generate jobs and increase the sustainability of the village.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			More paths & cycleways will not stop people using their cars – world we live in people are lazy.	Noted. See response in PC58 6.8	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC73	B. Golding	Especially agree that central area needs short term parking restrictions to enable better shopping access and so encourage businesses to return to our centre. It is time to enforce parking area planning?	Noted. This is an issues outside of the Neighbourhood Plan but parking management proposals may assist in alleviating parking pressure in the village centre as will Policy EB.T1	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC74	No Name	Care should be taken when granting permission to build in gardens sometimes the new buildings are larger than the original and therefore take over instead of blending in. So don't wholeheartedly agree with fill in building.	Noted. Criteria in Policy EB.GD1 should address this concern	No Changes Required

6.8 Transport & Parking			In Station Road on street parking has become very difficult.	Noted	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Surely improved infrastructure isn't just about sports facilities – how about doctors, schools etc – things that are truly essential?	These contributions will also be required. Policy EB. DC1 focusses on community facilities and contributions for these.	
	PC75				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC76	No Name	Why isn't the large house by A4500 traffic lights not included? Why isn't the employment area off A4500 included?	See response in PC1	New Lodge and New Lodge Vineyard properties to be included within the boundary line. Employment area north of A4500 does not meet boundary criteria 6.1B
6.3 Windfall Sites			Development permitted to sites abutting the village boundary if for affordable housing? How will this change the size & character of the village?	Exception sites for affordable housing may be granted in exceptional circumstances where the housing meets an identified need. Developments will be small in nature and therefore the impact on the village will be minimal.	No other Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			Existing Parking restrictions to be enforced.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			No development (anywhere in village) should have a negative impact on these 'areas of constrained access'	Noted	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Funding of highway improvements to 'areas of constrained access'	Highway improvements may be required on a site by site basis. Policy EB.DC1 focusses on community infrastructure and facilities.	
	PC77				

General/All	PC78	No Name	No building in Earls Barton.	See response in PC45	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC79	No Name	Yes, providing that distance from existing properties in the vicinity are respected and access onto A4500 does not cause and congestion problems	Noted	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites			But parking in the village is already a problem so we don't want to make it worse.	Noted	
6.4 Environment & Design			We must maintain the history and 'village' attractions and not become a 'small town'	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Must maintain our green areas	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Must keep the village alive and allow local business to grow. One national retailer (Co-op) is enough. Rather buy from local suppliers. Please don't ever allow Tesco or Sainsbury etc to open in Earls Barton. Must keep post office too.	Noted	
6.7 Employment			More employment opportunities are great. Think carefully about housing development suppliers – many of these and skills providers should be local companies and people.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Must consider road and pavement use by mums with pushchairs and elderly people with restricted mobility etc	Noted	
6.9 Developer contributions			Must maintain the 'village' appeal.	Noted	

	PC80				
	PC81				
	PC82				
6.9 Developer Contributions	PC83	Mr D Smith	Earls Barton has an aging community. The provision of an elderly day centre could be considered (or built into the plans for the community hall)	Noted. Communities in general are aging. A day centre for the elderly has not been provided for as part of the plan but does not preclude it if an operator or the County Council wished to provide the service	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking 6.9 Developer Contributions	PC84	Mr Henson	Parking in the High Street needs double yellow lines – also Station Road Could do with a new school. Can't keep adding to the old one.	Policy EB.T1 will assist. Parking restrictions such as further double yellow lines will reduce resident's on-street parking and potential push the problem to other parts of the village. County Council has indicated that a new school is not viable. Options for schools' expansion are being considered	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking 6.9 Developer Contributions	PC85	Mr Hardy	Agreed in principle but only hope that stagecoach will not tamper with the buses, due to too much congestion. Thought they could contribute towards a new school for the juniors but apparently not on County remit.	Noted Agreed – See response in PC84 6.9	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation 6.8 Transport & Parking	PC86	Ms S. Payne	Concerns about the impact on New Barton. Live on King Street feel it is used as a 'rat run' between N'pton Road and W'boro Road – Suggest a one way system? Would like some thought about one way systems in New Barton. Feel that	A one way system would be a consideration for the Highway Authority. As the Grange development site only provides access via A4500 it is not considered that this will increase New Barton as a 'rat run' See comments above	No Changes Required

			King Street is being used as a 'rat run' between N'pton Rd and W'boro Rd- this may become worse when the Grange development is finished.		
	PC87				
	PC88				
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC89	Mr Webb	Suggest a complete parking restriction for West Street and Doddington Road below pedestrian crossing	See response in PC84 6.8	No Changes Required
6.1 Village Boundary	PC90		But we may have to develop over the village boundary if a vital service is required	Noted	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Badly needed sports facilities at the Grange Football club seem to be greedy too many pitches	See response in PC21 6.2	
6.3 Windfall Sites			Agree but what is affordable homes? We need more social housing for the young people of the village	Affordable homes include social rented housing and shared equity housing which are linked to local affordability	
6.4 Environment & Design			The view of All Saints Church from the Square is blotted out by trees in the Church Yard and around the large green. Some of these trees need removing so that visitors to the village can see this splendid Saxon tower.	Trees should be protected within the general landscape framework of the conservation area. Views will also be different at different times of the year and from different locations	
6.5 Open Space			A little common sense needs to be used	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			A good restaurant is required in village or one of the pubs could become a restaurant	Noted	No Changes Required
6.7 Employment					

6.8 Transport & Parking			An industrial estate (small) at the bottom of the B573. Junction of A45 would help with heavy traffic coming into the village	An extension to the existing industrial estate area is considered to be a better location.	
6.9 Developer Contributions			It's never going to alter in this village parking is a big problem and always will be. A very good bus service better than most other villages in the area.	Noted	
			Looks good but people should not be greedy.	Noted	
	PC91				
	PC92				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC93	Mr/Mrs Whitworth	As long as no other building of houses other than to the north of the village & land within village centre	Noted	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites			Yes – If it is taken into account that car parking is given to each dwelling (off road)	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			More walking footpaths (public) are needed across fields in & around the village	New footpaths are proposed form new developments areas. New footpath proposals across fields would require Rights of Way designation	Proposed Change – Footpath links to be shown on main Proposals Plan (Fig3)
6.8 Transport & Parking			Any enhanced parking will be welcomed and any additional traffic be discouraged also take into consideration the older residents who need transport to access facilities	Noted	

6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC94	Mr J Andrew	Limited housing! Not 280, plus the requirements of incoming tenants will not be catered for.	See response in PC45	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			Where is the space to accommodate these proposals	See response in PC8 6.6	No Changes Required
	PC95				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC96		It is meaningless	The Village Boundary policy provides a sensible policy to guide future development	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			There is no way that this will improve any aspect of village life. It certainly cannot improve transport links or access & parking in the village centre – indeed how could it?	Allocation of mixed use development will provide housing opportunities for local people and community facilities for the village.	
6.3 Windfall Sites			Windfall sites (or infilling) has been policy in the village for the last 30 years. There is very little potential for further development.	Opportunity for redevelopment of sites may occur over time as former uses potential become unviable.	
6.4 Environment & Design			There are too many ‘opt out’ words and phrases, respect, minimise etc are meaningless & unenforceable.	Policy needs to be consistent with National Guidance and Development Plan policies therefore considered to be appropriate.	
6.5 Open Space			Open space that is not accessible to all is not open space. Allotments are no more an open space than agricultural land.	Local Green Space as the policy defines local open space areas can be a variety of land.	
6.7 Employment			If industrial units were not being knocked down to provide land for housing there would be a varied range of business premises & no need to	Older industrial units and premises do not provide for the type of accommodation that modern	

<p>6.8 Transport & Parking</p> <p>6.9 Developer Contributions</p>			<p>expand an industrial estate that provides limited variety.</p> <p>No way that 'better parking' can be provided in the village centre, you know that so please stop pretending it's a possibility</p> <p>What happened to the money that was collected for the community hall?</p>	<p>businesses require. Therefore new premises are necessary.</p> <p>Additional parking in the heart of the village centre will be difficult to provide. The Parish Council is however looking at options to provide more parking to the north of the Recreation Grounds.</p> <p>These funds are not related to the Developer contributions, however the Parish Council retains a fund to deliver the sports and leisure facilities which has been a Council priority for a number of years.</p>	
<p>6.2 The Grange Allocation</p> <p>6.5 Open Space</p> <p>6.8 Transport & Parking</p> <p>6.9 Developer Contributions</p>	<p>PC97</p>		<p>If development as accepted as a need, development to the north greatly preferred.</p> <p>Unless legal requirement take out 'unless very exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated'. For the number of villagers there are very few green spaces and they should be sacrosanct.</p> <p>Another reason for not having building to the south of the village as has to come through the village to get to the moan roads and there is already too much congestion and bottlenecks.</p> <p>Rather not have the developers at all. If there are more houses and associated traffic there's not room for</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>There might be circumstances where this might be required therefore this flexibility is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No Changes Required</p>

			car parking and open spaces and allotments.		
	PC98				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC99	Ms S Hudson/Mr E O'Reilly	Important to include all green spaces	Only green spaces which have a justified value to residents and the community should be included	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Shame to take the football field. Open spaces are important.	The football and cricket pitches will be retained and further pitches provided	
6.3 Windfall Sites			Important – not to extend village and put pressure on existing facilities, traffic, access, school, shops etc	Noted	
6.4 Environment & Design			Worried about the increase in sustainable homes – impact negatively on existing homes/local character of village.	Adherence to design guidance through Policy EB.D1 should minimise this possibility	
6.5 Open Space			Open Spaces – the area of land behind Dowthorpe Hill (towards the A45) should be protected open space as it is integral to character of village.	See response in PC14 6.5	
6.6 Local Business			Important for Earls Barton to retain a separate identity.	Agreed	
6.7 Employment			Important to consider local employment and keep the village economically viable.	Agreed	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Think that is important to make Earls Barton accessible but to also retain the village identity.	Agreed	

6.9 Developer Contributions			Loss of any allotment space would be negative. Important to protect existing green spaces/areas	Agreed	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC100	Ms C Davis	There is a need for housing (supported) for people with learning disabilities to live. This will also provide jobs (caring etc)	Allocation of Grange and windfall development will provide opportunity to deliver supported living accommodation. Housing Needs Survey did not raise this as a significant issue however, the plan does not preclude this.	No Changes Required
6.4 Environment & Design			V. Important	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			V. Important	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			If a retail premise is vacant for more than 6 months, could we open a village craft shop – handmade items etc.	A commercial arrangement would need to be entered into with the owners of these premises	
6.7 Employment			See comments on 6.2	See comments above	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Need more disabled/blue badge parking	This can be achieved outside of the Neighbourhood Plan through parking management controls. Further parking provision would support further allocation of disabled parking bays.	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Objectives: Improve resident's quality of life by improving services, facilities and opportunities within E.B.	Noted	
General			'Housing Benefit helps the lowest income groups' My son has a disability and lives on DLA and ESA. Housing	Noted	

			benefit would not cover private rental in E band he is not eligible for social housing in E.B. He needs help from the plan.		
6.1 Village Boundary	PC101		Far too large	See response in PC45	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC102	Mr B Garratt	There are a number of 'pockets' of land where sensitive development would enhance the village. I would like to see these completed in line with the criteria.	Noted	No Changes Required
6.4 Environment & Design			V. Important	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Open Space proposals are an important aspect to maintain balance with developed land but also amenity for the residents	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Important for these residents who do not have access to a car and to avoid non-essential journeys into local towns	Noted	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC103		Too much development in first place – will impact the top end of the village dramatically. 280 houses exceeds the required amount for 20 years. There is also an unspecified area for 'retail'. What will be here?	See response in PC45. There is no retail area specified for the Grange development, these uses are best located in the centre of the village. An employment area is allocated to help provide additional jobs for the village.	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			Could a 'drop off zone' be considered in front of the library for school times? Many people do not need to park up for Junior School Children and a drop zone would be beneficial.	This proposal has been considered here or within the library car park however space and funding have been an issue. The options for school expansion which are being	

				considered may provide a potential solution however the Library and Schools have separate objectives and requirements.	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC104		Must make the 'Grange' really for sports for all our villagers, young and old. A good building for all to meet, build houses on the far side of the games fields with outlet to the A4500 road.	Agreed - this is part of the plan proposal.	No Changes Required
6.7 Employment			Make room for our teenagers to work in village with new businesses	Noted – the plan helps to provide for this.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Must sort out the parking in village. 2 hrs recharge. Too many people leaving their cars here and take the bus into town for work.	Parking management controls could deliver this and is something the Parish Council is considering.	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC105		There is no mention of schools parking.	See response in PC103 6.8	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC106		Would rather housing allocation stayed under 256 new dwellings, not over 400. Would like as many windfall sites to be included in overall new dwellings.	Overall housing for village over the plan period likely to 400 or slightly more. Allocation of Grange site provides for total identified needs and 280 houses is the maximum amount allowed.	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites			Why do infill sites have to fall under the affordable housing requirement, particularly single dwellings?	All development sites should be providing contributions towards affordable housing – Exception sites outside of the village boundary, if appropriate will, provide most affordable housing but single dwellings would not require to be affordable. Agreed	

6.5 Open Space			New developments should include open space to avoid it feeling too urbanised.		
6.6 Local Business			Local business would have to stay as small businesses to maintain the feel of the village e.g. No Tesco!	Businesses within the defined village centre would need to respect the existing character and take account of the conservation area appraisal.	
6.5 Open Space	PC107		Pleased that school site is protected	Noted	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			Definitely need more bespoke shops in village e.g. deli etc	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC108	Mehrtens	Need to have positive negotiations with Barkers regarding parking facilities	Barkers already allow a certain number of parking spaces for village retailer parking	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer Contributions			Desperately need more facilities for organised activities for 6-10 year olds other than football & cricket. Girls can do either but would rather have something else i.e. dance/gym	Provision of land at the Grange for sports and leisure provides opportunity for community hall and indoor sports subject to funding	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC109	Ms J. Halliday	Make sure this is 'stuck to'	Noted	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Whilst under construction lorries etc should use A4500 and not come into village centre	This would be a requirement of the planning consent.	
6.3 Windfall Sites			Provided 'infill' is not 'intrusive' to existing properties	Noted	
6.4 Environment & Design			All new houses should have 'grey water' facilities and solar panels	Sustainable and renewable energy options will be promoted through guidance in the Sustainable Design SPD. All housing will be required to	

6.5 Open Space			V. Important the present open space remains and new housing areas are not overly built upon but have green areas & gardens	meet building regulations and Code for Sustainable Homes standards Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Important to have shops etc for use by local people & encourage visitors – they help our village economy. Parking must be addressed.	Noted	
6.7 Employment			Employment expansion should not be out of character with the village. Small business opportunities – an excellent idea. All new businesses must have enough parking for all staff.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			See above & new development must have enough off road parking.	Noted. Policy EB.T1 will assist in minimising the impact of development on existing on-street parking	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Make enough off road parking. Put solar panels on each house & business. Provide 'grey water' facilities, make sure developers do actually contribute to village facilities e.g. schools, doctors etc plus the ones mentioned.	Noted. See comments above.	
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC110		However, 11 houses at 58 Bowlers Yard, 8 houses on the old Butchers Yard. Do they meet the criteria? Surely they will cause traffic congestion?	Applications for these sites have come in ahead of the Neighbourhood Plan being adopted future proposals will need to	No Changes Required

6.6 Local Business			Should be proud of our local shops, the village has an ideal shaped centre to attract shops & services. However, parking?	consider pressure on on-street parking Noted	
6.7 Employment			Lucky to have an industrial estate which gives added value to the village and is far enough away from the centre not to be an eyesore, with its own access, so a bit more development in this area is ok	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			You state that 90% of respondents say parking is a concern but I cannot see any solution to the problem in the plan. Without a solution surely it will get worse. Buses/cycle ways/pedestrian ways are not one.	See response in PC96 6.8	
	PC111				
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC112		What is the definition of 'those with a strong connection to Earls Barton'?	This would include people who have been brought up in the village or have family connections.	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC113	Ms B Wright	I fail to see how this will 'enhance' my way of life. This is a smoke screen as the village will be swamped.	See response in PC45.	No Changes Required
6.4 Environment & Design			Why can't this be achieved anyway, regardless of development?	Policy EB.D1 is to control the design and environmental performance of new development	
6.8 Transport & Parking			So much waffle it is difficult to understand exactly what is proposed.	Noted	

6.9 Developer Contributions			<p>You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.</p> <p>The proposed development will be a carbuncle on the edge of the village. The report is obviously written by a 'political animal' and is difficult to read. It often contradicts itself as any development does nothing to enhance the village.</p>	<p>A certain level of housing needs to be accommodated within the village over the plan period. The plan is written in the way it has so that the policies can be used by the Local Planning Authority when assessing applications and they can be effectively applied.</p>	
<p>6.1 Village Boundary</p> <p>6.2 The Grange Allocation</p> <p>6.3 Windfall Sites</p> <p>6.4 Environment & Design</p>	PC114		<p>The village boundary seems to be drawn to suit needs at that time...</p> <p>Will not agree until final proposals have been made public for type of houses to be built and exactly what the site layout will be. Also doubt DWH will 'donate' all the land they are promising and more houses will be built.</p> <p>Many residents preferred to see infill sites used – this has been common practice over recent years. The DWH site will mean loss of privacy, daylight and visual intrusion to many residents. It will spoil a very rural peaceful location.</p> <p>There is no specific information yet? It is all just draft suggestions. We need</p>	<p>The village boundary should be reassessed and altered at the time the plan is being produced or reviewed as the objectives of the plan may change over time.</p> <p>The precise number and mix of houses will be provided in a reserved matters application but should take account of the Housing Needs Survey. The level of land transfer for sports and leisure uses will be fixed within a legal agreement.</p> <p>This was not the response from the consultation undertaken which indicated clearly that for the level of housing that needed to be accommodated a comprehensive northern focused development site was preferred.</p> <p>The footpath into the development will be enhanced other pedestrian</p>	No Changes Required

6.5 Open Space			<p>actual & exact plans. The footpath will obviously be severely damaged. It currently is in a field it will soon be part of a housing development?</p> <p>If the Grange is already identified as local green space then surely it is nonsensical to suggest building large properties on it? The fields adjoining the Grange are well used by local dog owners and walkers.</p>	<p>links will be provide to the east of the site.</p> <p>The Grange has not previously been allocated as Local Green Space, however, it is within the plan to protect this area.</p>	
6.6 Local Business			<p>We have most things needed in the village and most people are able to travel to W'boro or N'pton for other needs.</p>	<p>Further convenience retail and services to provide for a growing population is considered to be beneficial for the sustainability of the village. Higher level services will be available at neighbouring towns.</p>	
6.7 Employment			<p>More clarification needed regarding industrial space. I believe there are already empty units on the industrial estate which would suggest no more required?</p>	<p>Older commercial accommodation is not always suitable for modern business requirements and a small business centre is also considered to be desirable for local small businesses and start ups</p>	
6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>All the areas around the traffic lights on the A4500 are congested at times/ especially Northampton Road. This will need major road works if this large development goes ahead. Cars drive very fast along the A4500.</p>	<p>Transport improvements requirements by the Highways Authority have been identified through conditions and developer obligations within s106 agreement attached to the planning application.</p>	

6.9 Developer Contributions			<p>The difference to what is proposed and what actually happens we will only know after many years. DWH are only interested in money & profit – they do not care about the local environment. Do we want building sites until 2031 blotting the landscape – I think not!</p>	<p>A legal agreement will be signed for the obligations required by the developer and can be enforced.</p>	
<p>6.1 Village Boundary</p> <p>6.2 The Grange Allocation</p>	PC115	Mr R Moore	<p>The Grange area has undeveloped land (agricultural) and planning permission for a sports playing field (Class D2) and therefore should be currently excluded from the village boundary.</p> <p>Site specific policy does not allow any potential for future expansion of leisure and sporting facilities for the long term and only caters for the village’s immediate needs, this is very short sighted. The policy is also far short of the Sports and Leisure Visualisation that was originally adopted by the residents of Earls Barton. This site should never have been put forward as a neighbourhood ‘option’ for a 280 housing development. It was only the knee jerk reaction from the campaigning NIMBY’s from the Redrow & Bowbridge applications that has carried it forward.</p>	<p>The previous planning application for sports playing fields has elapsed and to deliver any sports provision it is considered that a combination of housing, employment and open space for leisure is the best way to secure this.</p> <p>The Grange site has been a potential development since the inception of the neighbourhood plan. Following consultation on strategic options the community indicated their support for a comprehensive development to the north of the village. This was prior to the applications along Station Road. The previous sports and leisure proposal could not be delivered due to lack of funding, therefore, although the current scheme cannot accommodate all sports provision it will safeguard facilities for both football and cricket and may provide the ability to accommodate other sports in future.</p>	No Changes Required

6.5 Open Space			<p>Conserve and allocate more land at the Grange site, for the potential future expansion/development of Recreation, Sports & Leisure, as per the original visualisation adopted by the residents of Earls Barton. Maybe a site specific proposal for developing only the field to the East with possibly 100 or so houses could be the answer? Would then still meet the housing needs of 256 dwellings for 2011-31. But, then again, are we sure, we want to build houses over an old quarry? Surely it would be preferably, just for community value, to allocate this particular land, for future industry expansion and employment, which would then keep it all together, on the periphery of the village.</p> <p>Where are all the existing cycleways that have been constantly referred to? Is it not time that it was made safer for EB cyclists. Dangerous when cycling the streets off the square because of the parked cars. Nothing in the village that encourages cyclist safety. What is the point of proposing enhanced links from any new developments, when there are no marked existing routes for cyclists?</p>	<p>See comments above. The comprehensive proposal put forward in the planning application was the only scenario which would allow for a significant transfer of sports and leisure land and also to make the development viable.</p> <p>Providing separate cycleways on existing highways will be difficult to achieve due to road widths and requirements for pavements. Pedestrian and cycle links are promoted where possible and greater safety for cyclists should be implemented where possible.</p>	
6.8 Transport & Parking					
6.1 Village Boundary	PC116	Mr T Mobbs	<p>Village should not expand outside this space. 'Green Belt' land surrounding the village should be maintained. We may have a large population for a</p>	<p>Noted – Boundary does need to be reviewed and altered to allow for the expansion of the village to meet local needs.</p>	No Changes Required

6.2 The Grange Allocation			village but we are, nevertheless, a village first & foremost.		
6.3 Windfall Sites			It is the only site that makes sense because it delivers a mixed use solution.	Noted	
6.4 Environment & Design			Windfall sites within the existing boundaries (brownfield sites) are important to tidy up areas of the village that have fallen into disuse (a good example is the development on the old Blitz site in Broad Street)	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Especially important to keep the focus on the Church and area in the village centre. This gives the village its character.	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			These must be maintained at all costs. The 'Rec' is a particularly important area in the heart of the village.	Noted	
6.7 Employment			Must carefully manage our food outlet choice. Have more than enough choices for Indian food. Should also be encouraging our remaining pubs before they become a thing of the past.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Must try to provide more local jobs to help residents and reduce their travel needs.	Noted	
			Agreement with proviso that parking is allowed for employees of local	Noted – Barkers do provide a limited number of spaces already	

6.9 Developer Contributions			<p>businesses and that bad parking (on double yellow lines) is taken care of. The village needs a car park on the existing Barker's Site that has capacity.</p> <p>The developers will prosper as sites get underway and they should put something back in return.</p>	<p>for employees of local businesses to use</p> <p>Noted</p>	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC117	Ms J White	<p>But still too many houses I thought a lot less houses had been approved in earlier plans: Why has this changed?</p>	<p>The number of houses has been determined by the Housing Needs Survey and the demonstrated needs of the village as well as the viability of the site to bring forward community benefits. 280 houses is the maximum permitted, less may come forward in an Reserved Matter applications</p>	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>Did not see any proposals.</p>	<p>Policy EB.T1 seeks to minimise the impact of new development on traffic and parking within the village.</p>	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC118	Mr M Biggs	<p>Our village should retain its identity and retain its present boundary</p>	<p>See response in PC116 6.1</p>	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			<p>Think the excellent access makes this the best site for a housing development and it causes the least impact in the village.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
6.4 Environment & Design			<p>The proposed Redrow development off Allebone Road showed complete lack of sensitivity of existing villagers as the plans showed a house was to be built within feet of my garden.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

6.5 Open Space			V. Important that our village retains its green areas and does not become one huge building site.	Noted.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Agree that congestion is already a major problem especially in Station Road and further development in this part of the village will only exacerbate this.	Noted.	
6.9 Developer Contributions			It can be good for the village if it has better parking areas and sports facilities	Noted	
	PC119				
	PC120				
	PC121				
	PC122				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC123		Development of this site will mean no construction traffic need pass through the village	Noted	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC124	Mr & Mrs Stafford	No more than 250 new dwellings should be built between the Grange/Industrial estate as with other infill sites this should be more than enough to meet the housing needs of 256 homes	The allocation of 256 would be the minimum housing units the village should provide. The allocation of 280 dwellings at the Grange will be the upper limit on this site and will help secure the transfer of land for sports and leisure facilities.	No Changes Required
6.4 Environment & Design			Conservation area very important in maintaining village character.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Concerned that any development by Redrow will exacerbate the amount of traffic using Dowthorpe Hill	Noted	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC125	Mr P Cross	Report recognises the age profile of the village is below average for the 20-	Mixed of housing types and sizes will be identified in the reserve	No Changes Required

6.3 Windfall Sites			39 age group. This needs to be recognised when deciding on the size of houses to build and provide them with suitable housing.	matters application. This will be influenced by housing needs survey and Strategic Housing Market Assessment which demonstrate a need for more 1 and 2 bedroom properties	
6.5 Open Space			Commercial Development is important and should try to cater for existing villagers	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Essential – green space is part of our village and mustn't be destroyed	Noted	
6.7 Employment			Increasing number of villagers will help to support local facilities and services.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Fully agree with objectives stated in the plan.	Noted	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Parking – easy to say we need additional parking but difficult to provide. Barkers sit on a large piece of land can they be persuaded to allow cars to park there?	A certain number of parking spaces are already provided during the day to allow retail employees to park at the Barkers Site.	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC126	Mrs J Cross	Developers should be willing to put something back into the village	Noted	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Important to keep the village compact, otherwise it will lose its village feel	Noted	
			Housing for young people should be a priority but also consider provision of suitable housing for older people.	Noted – greater provision of 1 and 2 bedroom properties should be provided in line with demand. EB.T1 requires that developments	

6.4 Environment & Design			3/4/5 bedroom houses should have sufficient off-street parking	do not create additional on-street parking pressure.	
			Due consideration must be given to sustainability, both of buildings & the environment. Natural habitats should not be sacrificed to profit.	Noted	
6.5 Open Spaces			Agree wholeheartedly – green spaces vital to our well-being.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Don't rely on professional traffic surveys – always underestimate. Should consider extending the constrained access to the whole of Station Road. Desperately need more parking space in centre – compulsory purchase part of Barkers land	Areas of constrained access are identified as where the road width is narrower and parking is a problem on both sides of the road. Most of Station Road is included but some parts have sufficient width and limited on street parking and therefore are not included. CPO of Barkers land is not a realistic option. Some parking is already provided by Barkers.	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Most certainly – they will ensure that they have huge profits and we should have something in return.	Noted	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC127	Ms H Higham	Keep number of dwellings to lowest possible minimum; and ensure very good 'shield' planting to screen existing properties from new development [Elizabeth way/Hornby Road]. Hope for any late night use/noise of any community hall to be closely monitored/policed.	Allocation of 280 dwellings is considered to be the requirement to provide for housing for the village and to deliver sports and leisure community benefits. Policy EB.G1 requires that development should respect amenity of existing residents. Community Hall if in future located at the Grange would require a licence etc if a bar is	No Changes Required

6.3 Windfall Sites			<p>Agree on the whole, but not EB.GD2 though plenty of criteria do not agree with sites outside but abutting the village boundary. This could lead to what we currently have with Redrow etc putting in forced developments under cloak of need. Protect our village boundary.</p>	<p>operated and Parish Council would monitor activity.</p> <p>In certain circumstances the provision of small scale development outside of the village boundary may be appropriate. However, the scale of development envisaged by current proposals would not fall within this criteria.</p>	
6.4 Environment & Design			<p>Village centre and all heritage sites must be protected. Also the surrounding countryside. Nene Valley EU designated areas must not be disturbed re the unacceptable proposed Marina by the locks. Day boats/increase use of the river will disturb birds and wildlife. This should not happen.</p>	<p>The protection of the village's heritage is set out in the plan as well as protecting the environment and Nene Valley. There are not proposals to increase the use of this part of the river Nene.</p>	<p>Proposed Change – See STAT7 (Statutory Agencies comments & Response Table)</p>
6.6 Local Business			<p>Don't let existing housing be changed to business use, else will add to housing shortages unless very limited properties being affected.</p>	<p>Residential buildings within the village retail and business area may benefit the village in the additional facilities which are delivered. The amount of properties affected is likely to be very limited.</p>	<p>No Changes Required</p>
6.7 Employment			<p>Better to be adjacent to, part of existing industrial estate. Only services open to and benefiting the general public in/nearer village centre with very limited additional such places to provide such services (shops)</p>	<p>Noted – shops and services open to the public would be concentrated in the village centre.</p>	

6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>But where would additional parking be provided? Don't want to see a mini (or worse) multi-storey car park appear in the village centre.</p> <p>All too often new housing developments appear to be put in with no thought to the impact on the existing community & the increased needs this brings. This needs to be done with sensitivity and foresight to lessen the impact on the village and its existing services.</p>	<p>Providing new car parking capacity will be a challenge and further parking controls may need to be considered. A multi-storey car park would not be required or financially viable</p> <p>Noted</p>	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer Contributions					
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC128	Mr & Mrs Edwards	<p>Seems to be plenty of parking spaces within Barker's site – off West St in particular. A small parking fee charged by this company might encourage them to be co-operative.</p> <p>Hopefully the planned expansion to EB village schools will be adequate for folk moving into these new houses</p>	<p>Some limited parking spaces are already provided by Barkers for retail workers in the village centre.</p> <p>Options for schools' expansion is being considered and extra capacity will be introduced at a required point.</p>	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer contributions					
	PC129				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC130	Mr S Buckley	<p>Reflects the concerns of the residents in attempting to protect those areas at risk of over development whilst recognising the need for areas which can sustainably support further housing within the northern area of the village without impacting significantly on road capacity of the village as a whole.</p>	Noted	No Changes Required

6.2 The Grange Allocation			Grange development addresses and meets the needs of both residents in the form of improved sports and community facilities. There is the opportunity for a new generation of home buyers to live within a desirable location.	Noted	
6.3 Windfall Sites			Within THE VILLAGE BOUNDARY. Recognise the need for a windfall strategy of developments. If look at housing development over the past 3 years together with the Grange proposal – in excess of 350 homes which is more than our fair share of CSS requirements.	Noted	
6.4 Environment & Design			Agree and support the sentiments within E&D policy which seeks to maintain Earls Barton as a desirable place to live preserving best elements of its rural location whilst insisting that where there is new development (inside the village boundary) it is of a high quality.	Noted	
6.5 Open Space			Protecting those highly important green areas including agricultural landstocks within the village and its surrounds which maintains its arable and pastured lands as well as those recreational areas which together allow the community to breathe.	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Reflects concerns of residents in attempting to protect those areas of	Noted	

6.7 Employment			<p>the village at risk of over development and density issues traffic etc whilst recognising the need for our <u>fair share</u> areas which can sustainably support further housing within the northern area of the village without significantly impacting on the road capacity of the village as a whole.</p> <p>Grange development addresses and meets the needs of both residents in the form of improved sports and community facilities. There is the opportunity for a new generation of home buyers to live within a desirable location and there is an opportunity for small business growth and development within and existing area. The development alongside other already approved housing in the village will total over 400 in the last 3 years – more than our share.</p>	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>Recognise the need for a plan around transport & parking and as such this is a reason for resisting any speculative development in the south of the village as the Grange proposal accommodates these factors. Station Rd itself busy enough without further potential developments.</p>	Noted	
6.9 Developer Contributions			<p>Agree in principle that developers should contribute and certainly within the Grange Project. Also ask if developer who successfully appealed</p>	Noted – Developments such as the Compton Way scheme will contribution towards facilities such as education and public transport –	

			on the 65 homes on Compton Way will be contributing to sustainable developments within the village, possibly towards the additional village centre car parking on Barkers maybe? My concern is that the process of this is not transparent or ring fenced by county council.	all contributions provided for the County Council will need to be spent on those items/issues approved in the s106 legal agreement and are ring fenced for these purposes.	
	PC131				
6.6 Local Business	PC132	Mr & Mrs Smith	The only facility that we feel is needed is a bank. Further expansion of existing facilities would only strengthen the position of those wishing to expand the village.	Unfortunately the type of facilities attracted to the village will depend upon market demand and operators desire to provide services in this location.	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC133		Would have liked the proposed development spread over the 20 years	It is not feasible or reasonable to phase a development of this size over 20 years	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer contributions			Felt the questions could have a double meaning and a simple yes/no was not always appropriate.	Noted	
	PC134				
Gen.	PC135	Mr M Baker	Concerned with impact on Infant & Junior Schools – not addressed in the plan. Normal that a mini ‘baby boom’ follows building of a new medium to large housing estate and the impact of this should be modelled.	Discussions have taken place with County Council and the schools to consider future growth proposals. With amount of housing proposed it is considered that extra capacity for additional pupils can be provided on the existing site through extensions. Various options are being considered at the present time and the impact of new homes does not become apparent for several years.	No Changes Required

6.2 The Grange Allocation			<p>Grange development of 280 dwellings exceeds housing needs of 256 at present. Could 65 dwellings at the back of Compton Way be deferred? Appears to be no provision for needs of residents on 80+ age group with regard to sheltered housing or care home facilities</p>	<p>256 dwellings is the minimum requirement for the village. Once developments have planning permission there is usually a limit to develop the scheme otherwise the consent lapses. It would not be possible to defer this development. Elderly people's housing needs will be addressed to an extent through the type and tenure of the housing developed. Care home provision is likely to be provided in areas of significant need and the plan does not prejudice this happening.</p>	
6.4 Environment & Design			<p>Concerned about design of housing and effect of 3/4 bedroom properties with inadequate parking.</p>	<p>Noted – a range of housing will be provided with both off-street and on street parking.</p>	
6.8 Transport & Parking			<p>Major concerns of the village are parking and congestion – not enough data on parking issues. Present issues and on-street parking are not being addressed. Parking provision for new developments – 1.5 per dwelling – where does this figure come from? More people have 2 cars or more. Figure should be based on the individual car density and type of property. Estate roads in recent years have seen increase in delivery van traffic which will increase in line with growth of this form of shopping but width of estate roads has been reduced – needs consideration</p>	<p>New development cannot be forced to rectify the existing parking issues in the village. Parking standards of 1.5 places per dwelling are set by the Highway Authority and act as an average across a whole development where different house sizes and numbers of bedrooms will mean different parking requirements are generated. Estate roads will need to be designed in accordance with the standard applied by the local Highway Authority through best practice guidance in the Manual for Street.</p>	
	PC136				

	PC137				
	PC138				
6.5 Open Space	PC139		Protect school playground and exercise space.	Noted – Policy EB.OS1/02 provides for this.	No Changes Required
	PC140				
	PC141				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC142		Do not want the ‘village’ to get much bigger.	Noted	No Changes Required
6.4 Environment & Design			We need to keep the village ‘a village’ or else it will become just a housing estate the roads are already chock a block i.e. Station Rd, whenever I go down you have to weave in and out of the parking cars.	A balance needs to be struck between providing for the future needs of the village and protecting the characteristics of the village and why it is appealing as a place to live. The plan seeks to do this.	
6.5 Open Space			Keep as much open space as possible. No more building.	Some building is required but important open space has been protected.	
6.7 Employment			We need businesses to survive.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Shame the X4 does not come through the Square, more people would use it if it did. It takes 20mins to walk to the Police Stn stop.	Noted – the location of the bus stop will be a variety of factors one of these is a requirement to keep the service to the major routes and not to get congested in village traffic	
6.9 Developer contributions			Please no developments behind Dowthorpe Hill and Station Rd.	The proposals are to focus development to the north of the village around the Grange.	
	PC143				
	PC144				

6.5 Open Space	PC145		Think that preservation of open space should be a very high priority.	Noted	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			Think that any opportunities that arise to improve and increase parking near the village centre and to improve routes for cyclists and pedestrians should be taken.	Noted	
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC146	Ms Knowlton	Essential that any development in the future includes affordable housing to ensure that local people are able to remain in the area.	Noted - Affordable housing (30%) will be a part of the proposals for the Grange development.	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Space			Maintaining open spaces to conserve the 'village' character is a vital part of the plan.	Noted	
6.9 Developer Contributions			Proposals will certainly add favourable provisions for the people of the village.	Noted	
	PC147				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC148	Mr R Coy	As long as this restricts new development of the village to this area and stops the applications to the south	Noted	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			Village centre parking needs to be improved prior to any large development.	No allocation of additional parking capacity has been provided for in the plan although this would not prevent it from taking place. A variety of measures including additional parking controls are likely to be necessary to assist in relieving the pressure on parking.	
	PC149				
	PC150				

	PC151				
Gen. s1.3	PC152	Peter Moore (Bletsoes) on behalf of Beaty Family	Concerned NP is premature in relation to wider planning policy. Concerned that minimum figure identified for housing is premature. Any figure should be derived from properly prepared development plans ..	The EBNP has a robust methodology for the determination of its housing numbers. This has been set out in an accompanying report to the Plan which is based on a local housing needs survey conducted with WBC.	No Changes Required
Gen s3			Support concept of Sustainable Development should be noted that EB is second largest settlement in Borough with a good range of services	Noted	No Changes Required
6.1			Village boundary – rather than a defined line a criteria based analysis should be considered	Village boundary lines are a common planning policy tool and it is not considered necessary to change this approach.	No Changes Required
6.3			This Section of the plan should be phrased more positively and should support development on the edge of the village where appropriate sites are available for development	Agreed	Proposed Changes – word policies more positively
6.4			Support general objective of this policy but too prescriptive and beyond scope of NP in some instances	Noted – do not believe policy goes beyond what is legally supportable or is too prescriptive. See proposed changes in STAT6	Proposed Changes as in STAT6
6.7			Support general objectives of policy but should be more positive. In appropriate to restrict opportunities that may be brought forward	Noted – Disagree. Traffic impact criteria is to protect other neighbouring uses amenity.	No Changes Required
				Noted – Survey work has been undertaken in collaboration with	No Changes Required

6.8			Object to policy EB.T1 on basis that it is not based on robust evidence – also unnecessary because Highways Auth. Are able to review proposals.	NCC to provide evidence to underpin this policy.	
Gen. Introduction	PC153	Craig Barnes (Gladman)	Plan cannot be considered in compliance with basic conditions ahead of NNJCS Believe that level of growth unsound Plan allocates nothing more than is already committed to be existing Planning Permissions	NPPG states that NPs can come ahead of strategic policy documents. EBNPPG believe that Basic Conditions can be met. EBNP has a robust methodology for the determination of its housing numbers. This has been set out in an accompanying report to the Plan which is based on a local housing needs survey conducted with WBC. Disagree – the EBNP allocates a major extension to the village incorporating 280 dwellings, employment land and sports and leisure facilities over and above what is already committed.	No Changes Required No Changes Required
6.2			Gladman submit following would be more consistent against NPPF 'Development will be permitted in the open countryside provided that adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so'	Disagree – EBNPPG believes that sufficient housing and development land has been allocated to cater for local needs as well as contributing towards the wider housing needs of NN. Further small scale development will be permitted subject to the criteria set out in GD1 and GD2. However, it is not consistent with the NP, NNJCS or emerging NNJCS that additional significant growth is focussed on Earls Barton.	No Changes Required

6.7			EB1 & EB2 potential under provide for employment land as justified against out of date policies	Disagree – NNJCS and emerging JCS reaffirm that major grow will occur at the most sustainable locations - the growth towns. EBNP has taken the opportunity to strength its employment base and offer by allocating significant employment land to provide opportunities for a growing population.	No Changes Required
6.4			Lack of detail for criteria on-site waste management and performance against sustainable design standards	See STAT13 – deleted bullet point 6. Retain bullet point 7 as the Sustainable Design SPD has a checklist which is a defined procedure.	Proposed Change – See STAT13 delete bullet point 6 from policy EB.D1
			Many of policy requirements established by EBNP (such as the approach to SUDs and Code for Sustainable Homes in EB.D1) mirror national and local standards.	Most of these requirements have been requested to be highlighted in the plan by Statutory Agencies.	No Changes Required
			Policies within the plan should be more visibly presented and clearly/logically numbered.	Agree with first part. Numbering of NP has been informed by Borough Council who will be using the policies.	Proposed Change – Put boxes around polices to highlight them.
	PC154	Eleanor Gingell (Pegasus Group) on behalf of Redrow Homes	Do not believe that plan can proceed to reg.15 stage as it will not meet basic conditions – currently in conflict with NPPF	NPPG states that NPs can come ahead of strategic policy documents. EBNPPG believe that Basic Conditions can be met.	No Changes Required
			Disagree with comment at p8 – whilst planning applications are ‘still’ determined by Borough Council ‘the NP gives local people the control to decide where the housing and any	Partial agree – wording of paragraph is not completely clear therefore change proposed.	Proposed change p8 1.3 last sentence. ‘While planning applications are still determined by the Borough Council of

Gen.			<p>additional retail, leisure and employment development should go.’ – no basis in NPPF for such a conclusion.</p> <p>Believe that EBNP is at odds with NPPF Para 47 which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. ... should not come forward ahead of independently examined housing figures for Borough and wider NN. Reference to legal challenge against Cheshire West.</p> <p>Plan’s Vision generally positive and objectives considered valid</p> <p>Plan chooses not to identify locally important heritage assets (such as those that are not listed or within the Conservation Area)</p> <p>Re-phrase some elements to make policies more positive</p>	<p>Disagree – EBNPPG believes it has a robust justification for the housing numbers determined for the plan and this is set out in an accompanying report to the plan. The decision in relation to Tattenhall NP appear to support the fact that NPs can come forward ahead of higher level plans.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Change considered through STAT13 to provide process to locally list buildings</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Wellingborough, <u>once made the Neighbourhood Plan gives local people the control to decide provides the local framework to guide where development should go and how it should be delivered according to the community’s wishes. the housing and any additional retail, leisure and employment development should go.</u></p> <p>No Changes Required</p> <p>Change proposed to add text to justification for EB.D1 See STAT13</p> <p>Proposed Changes – Word policies more positively</p>
------	--	--	--	---	---

6.1			<p>NP has little policy relating to the rural setting outside the village. Expressing type of development that may be suitable or ways in which the arable setting could contribute to wider green infrastructure objectives should be considered.</p> <p>Criteria for village boundary not supported. Specifically criterion F which excludes development that presently has planning permission. Urge that consideration given to including land off Station Road as a logical extension to the village boundary.</p>	<p>Disagree – the plan sets out clear criteria for potential development adjacent to the village boundary and acknowledges the role of the SPA and its relationship to the village.</p> <p>Partially agree – development has now commenced at Compton Way and as such it would be logical to include this area now rather than at the time of a review. Not agreed that Land off Station Road be included as there is no basis within the plan for the requirement of this level of extra development on top of the preferred extension of the village at the Grange.</p>	<p>No Changes Required</p> <p>Proposed Change p16 6.1 amend Criterion F ‘F. Areas of land with <u>unimplemented</u> planning permission or undeveloped land on the edge of the village adjacent to the main built up area will be excluded.’ Proposed change to village boundary line Fig3 p14. Include Compton Way site.</p>
6.2			<p>Do not agree with current policy in respect of site allocation. Believe Land off Station Road offers a better fit with objective of sustainable development, infill development and contributing to compact nature of the village</p> <p>The restriction on further development beyond that allocated within section 6.2 is not consistent</p>	<p>Disagree – the current site allocation around the Grange has the opportunity to bring forward a comprehensive village extension with significant community benefits which other sites do not. It is as equidistance from the centre to other proposed sites and provides more housing and employment development in a compact infill site bounded by the A4500.</p> <p>Disagree – Policy GD1 and GD2 allow for further windfall development and exception sites</p>	<p>No Changes Required</p> <p>No Changes Required</p>

			with NPPF para 47 which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing.	and the allocation site together with existing commitments and completions provide for almost 400 dwellings over the plan period.	
			Planning consent granted for allocation site. Plan needs to reflect this – local requirements to guide matters at detailed stage such as density etc are not present therefore missed opportunity.	Disagree – Policy EB.G1 contains a series of criterion that will guide and influence the build form of the development.	No Changes Required
6.3			Policies are not positive nor do they reflect the local character of the village.	Agree partially.	Proposed Change – Word policies more positively
6.4			Principles of policy agreed – opportunity to ensure that specific local matters are reflected within supporting text and remove ambiguity which is implicit in phrases such as ‘perform well’.	Disagree – criteria for Sustainable Design SPD and performance against this which is based on the Building for Life scheme is set by the NNJPU design forum which includes Borough Council planners. This currently requires 13 ‘greens’ for major applications to the questions posed but may change over time.	No Changes Required
6.5			Help to show areas of open space on a map and how they relate to one another and contribute to the character of the village	Fig 3. Does show the areas of open space.	No Changes Required
6.8			EB.T1 Objective of the policy is misplaced.	Disagree – consider that the policy will assist in not exacerbating the issues of parking within the village	No Changes Required

Gen.	PC155	Andrew Middleditch (Bletsoes) on behalf of Mallard Family	Act on behalf of Mrs & Mrs Mallard part owners of the Grange Site. Fully support the allocation of the site in EB.G1. Wish the NP to consider an amendment to the village boundary in the vicinity of Stevens Court to include land and buildings in their ownership. See area edged in blue on attached plan. Relates well to the built form of the settlement and site is worthy of redevelopment under proposed windfall policy.	A change to the village boundary is not considered necessary. Should proposals be acceptable under the windfall policy EB.GD2 then they could come forward although consideration of the open space OS10 setting would be required.	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Space 6.6 Local Business 6.7 Employment 6.8 Transport & Parking	PC156		Do not jeopardise our open spaces – good for villages and excellent for wildlife Providing more retail floorspace will change the village identity. More people, more cars, no parking facilities. The whole village concept will be destroyed. People work from home to save on overheads therefore it is unlikely they will want office space. If any development occurs it should be where the current industrial estate is situated. Bus services are adequate. Parking a thorny issue. Provision of off-road parking needed.	Noted The amount of additional retail floorspace is likely to be minimal. The retail/business area is presently almost entirely business uses. Noted – any office or new commercial floorspace would either be on an extension to the existing industrial estate or the new development area. New developments will need to provide sufficient off-road or on-street parking but this cannot rectify present problems.	No Changes Required
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC157	Mr & Mrs Nicholas	Agree with the proposal but do not fully understand how the infant and	Options for expansion on the present site are being explored.	No Changes Required

6.7 Employment			junior schools could expand when needed?	Extensions to existing buildings are likely to be the solution.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			If there is a central village facility where or how would additional parking be provided?	It is more than likely that any facility would be associated with the new development. Proposals that generate unacceptable parking impacts would not be permitted.	
			Still unsure how parking in the village centre will be improved?	See response in PC148 6.8	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC158	Mr A Gunn	Unable to answer this question because I do not understand why the Neighbourhood Plan boundary should be different than the Parish Boundary – particularly since the Neighbourhood Plan will become a plan for the Earls Barton Parish Council.	The village boundary line provides a mechanism to assist in where development should be located. The Parish Boundary is still the limit of the Neighbourhood Plan area.	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Yes, but subject to the proviso that the allocation of the land between the Grange and the Industrial Estate for sports and leisure and a new 'community hall' (5.94ha) is insufficient to provide the desired facilities.	The allocation of 5.94ha of sports and leisure land is in excess of what a development of this size should contribute. Therefore it is considered that although this is less land that previously envisaged for this facility it is a significant contribution.	
6.6 Local Business			Thought the delineated area in Fig 4. Appears to leave very little extra area for growth in business/retail units	The proposals allow for a limited increase in retail and services which would be in line with the size of the village and the settlement hierarchy in the CSS.	

6.9 Developer Contributions			Pleased to see that a new community hall/sports courts is the first of the priorities for use of the s106/CIL contributions.	The list of community benefits is not prioritised and it will be	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC159	Mr M Kennedy	Development 'local enough' to allow pedestrian access to village facilities but most commuter traffic will not need to be routed through village centre. Sports/community facilities needed.	Noted	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business			Would be good to have a business centre with facilities available for meetings. There is a lack of quality available professional space for hire/rent/purchase.	Noted	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Would be good to procure parking space in village centre – perhaps some of Barkers Site?	See response in PC128 6.8	
	PC160				
6.3 Windfall Sites	PC161	Mr J Kynoch	Local Residents concerned that the village will be turned into a town so limited development is crucial	Plan provides for a level of development which is in line with the needs of the village.	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			With the narrow village roads and no new parking areas in the village new developments will only make it worse	See response in PC156 6.8	
6.9 Developer contributions			Financial contributions must be an obligation to the developer rather than a request	Noted	
	PC162				
	PC163				
	PC164				

	PC165				
	PC166				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC167	Mr J O'Connor	The village centre can <u>no</u> way cope with this level of expansion	The level of development is in line with the future needs of the village. The focus of this development is to the north with access to the A4500 to limit the impact on the village centre.	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation			Development must occur but have serious concerns as to the existing infrastructure coping with 280 dwellings	Noted – See response above. Other infrastructure such as schools and healthcare will be increased as the village population grows.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Think bus routes should be restricted to main, larger roads, + parking addressed	Strategic buses (X4) already have this requirement – more local buses have to have access within the village.	
6.1 Village Boundary	PC168	Mr P Bannister	Extrapolating future population village will expand to around 6,400 (increase of 17%). In terms of statutory housing requirements village seems to be accommodating more that is necessary. Therefore important to resist other application around the village. Points raised about Neighbourhood Plan process and issues raised by developer regarding prematurity of the plan.	Noted.	No Changes Required
6.6 Local Business	PC169		Think that proper parking is an important element in supporting shops in the village centre	Noted	No Changes Required
6.1 Village Boundary	PC170		This is agricultural land and should not be included within the village boundary	The village boundary helps to delineate where development will be acceptable and where open countryside should be protected	No Changes Required

6.2 The Grange Allocation			Originally the plan was for sports fields. So why plan to build 280 dwellings on this site. It almost exceeds the total target for the next 20 years.	The previous plan for sport & leisure development was undeliverable as it required compulsory purchase of the land. This allocation provides for a significant amount of sports and leisure land as well as providing for the housing needs of the village over the next 20 years.	
6.8 Transport & Parking			Parking is the biggest problem. Only one small car park on the square any large development would have adverse effects on the problem.	See response in PC148 6.8	
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC171	Mr S Reeves	Form the point of view of access this site is the best choice with the A4500 nearby.	Noted	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			New restrictions seem good; there then needs to be a change in culture that could take a little longer	Noted	
	PC172				
	PC173				
	PC174				
	PC175				
6.1 Village Boundary	PC176	Mr N Bond	Need to be able to control any further development in this area.	See response in PC170 6.1	No Changes Required
6.5 Open Space			All should be totally preserved.	Noted	
6.6 Local Business			Need for manned police house at all times police cover not good enough at this time so won't be for future expansion.	Provision of Police house and mechanism of how the village is policed is not the remit of the plan	

6.9 Developer Contributions			All developers should give back to the Parish of E.B. not Wellingborough B.C.	With CIL the Parish Council will directly receive 25% of the contributions if the plan is adopted. S106 contributions are also usually ring fenced for specific impacts which occur within the village e.g. education, public transport contributions	
6.8 Transport & Parking	PC177	Mr & Mrs Nichols	Any new houses should have off street parking for at least 2 vehicles. Serious consideration should be given to introducing traffic calming in the village to reduce speeding (not sleeping policemen!)	See response in PC135 6.8 Traffic calming on existing roads would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority and potentially funded through CIL contributions although unlikely to be sufficient to make a significant change as introducing road design changes would be very expensive.	No Changes Required
	PC178				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC179		Agree with most of the policy with exception of 280 homes to be built. A much smaller quantity should be built since I believe the quantity proposed will not meet the desired criteria applicable to sections 6.2/6.3/6.4	See response in PC135 6.2	No Changes Required
	PC180				
6.5 Open Space	PC181		02 – if or when the Infant & Junior schools need to expand classroom space I hope it is not at the expense of the library	Options for the expansion of both schools is being considered however this does not include any part of the library	No Changes Required
6.8 Transport & Parking			Pleased to read that congestion & parking issues are being addressed in village centre	Noted – the policies will have some effect in reducing the pressure on parking and congestion.	
	PC182				

6.8 Transport & Parking	PC183	Mr M Haines	No solution proposed for the current parking problems – which will only get worse with development	Parking solutions (i.e. new car parks) cannot be promoted unless land was purchased or made available	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer Contributions			Especially support the development of a community hall	Noted	
	PC184				
	PC185				
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC186		Why no vehicular access into the Pyghtle then into Kings Street	The roads potentially connecting the development site to New Barton are in appropriate for increased traffic levels. Good pedestrian and cycle access will be made possible via these routes to the village centre.	No Changes Required
6.2 The Grange Allocation	PC187		States location will minimise impact & preserve for street parking and road use. However, they will still drive for the school run & visit the shops. Need to promote non-driving through the village. Encourage whole village to leave cars a home.	Location for major development for the village will reduce the number of vehicle movements through the village however it would not be possible to prevent people using their cars if they chose to. Plan will make it appealing for people to use direct pedestrian and cycle routes into the village centre.	No Changes Required
6.9 Developer Contributions			Looks impressive but developers could help invest in areas already in village. Heard Grange development will have a new pub. Why not invest in the ones we have?	The Grange allocation will not provide a new pub. A community hall may be developed if future funding can be provided and this may have a bar for functions. This already exists at the current sports pavilion. The best location for village facilities is in the centre and the plan helps to support this.	

<p>6.8 Transport & Parking</p> <p>6.9 Developer Contributions</p>	<p>PC188</p>		<p>Parking on perimeter of village centre would be preferable to encourage custom to business but not to 'clog' /congest the square.</p> <p>CIL would be a welcome introduction (alongside 106 agreements)</p>	<p>A balance needs to be reached in terms of increase capacity or turnover of parking in the village centre and also greater pressure on residential streets</p> <p>CIL will not be introduced until 2015 earliest therefore most of the housing development is likely to be contributing in the form of s106 agreements. When CIL payments are made the Parish Council will receive 25% of the contribution to go towards village infrastructure and community benefits.</p>	<p>No Changes Required</p>
<p>6.8 Transport & Parking</p>	<p>PC189</p>	<p>Mr & Mrs Drage</p>	<p>Cycle tracks do not mix with walkers – so dubious about.</p>	<p>Noted – consideration would be required in implementing cycle and pedestrian routes although they can work in proximity with each other.</p>	<p>No Changes Required</p>