

## **Spratton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**

### **Executive Summary of this statement**

1. A Village Design Statement (VDS), finally adopted in May 2013, was the fore-runner of the Neighbourhood Plan process, with the VDS consultation providing a very significant amount of (current) parishioner opinion and thinking.
2. Four major consultative exercises have taken place in  
November 2012  
March 2013  
November 2013  
September 2014
3. These have established parishioner preference for a housing policy of more gradual growth on sites not to be identified in the Plan (as has taken place in recent decades) rather than a single site approach.
4. The consultations (including the earlier one for the VDS) have also provided a whole raft of policies now in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Detailed statement**

#### **1. Village Design Statement fore-runner**

- 1.1. Many of the policies of the Spratton Neighbourhood Plan had their genesis in the Spratton Village Design Statement. This was finally adopted by Daventry District Council on 15 May 2013, so the process of formulating policies of the VDS overlaps with that of the consultation process for the Neighbourhood Plan. The main consultation for the VDS took place in June 2008 and this was well attended by parishioners with Councillor Millar, leader of Daventry District Council attending and addressing parishioners as shown in Figure 1.

*Figure1: Councillor Millar, leader of Daventry District Council, addressing parishioners on 22 June 2008 in Spratton Village Hall at the Spratton 'Have Your Say' day*



1.2. An extensive consultation document was available at the event and was subsequently circulated parish-wide. It was collected over the next 6 months, with 235 responses (about 25% of the registered electors) on a wide ranging number of issues. With adoption of the Plan being in May 2013, its policies are current, so these responses have informed the Neighbourhood Plan process alongside further consultations as follows.

## 2. Steering Group

2.1. Following a resolution by the Parish Council, the Plan project manager, Councillor Michael Heaton, formed a steering group which, other than himself and the chairman of the Parish Council, was made up from non-councillors and included a governor of the primary school, the headmaster of the independent school, two farmers, the owner of the Village Stores, an active member of CPRE, and four other parishioners. These represented a broad base of interests and experience in the parish. This group met on 14 November 2011 and noted that the Plan would propose sites with paybacks to parishioners, particularly schemes which might relieve the traffic to Spratton Hall School. It was also noted that it would be an intention to control further infill. The group met again on 16 January 2012 to discuss the way forward. It was agreed to hold a first public meeting, announced in the March 2012 Parish Newsletter which is circulated to all households in the Parish.

2.2. This first public meeting of the steering group took place on 1 April 2012. It was attended by some 45 parishioners, not counting parish councillors. The meeting fully endorsed the purpose of and need for a Plan.

2.3. The second meeting took place on 22 May 2012, with just 2 members of the public present. Councillor Barry Frenchman, Chair of the Parish Council and a Daventry District Councillor, stated that the purpose of the Plan was to seek to use the new legislation so that the Parish took control of the extent and location of future development. The entire meeting was given over to the site selection objective of the Steering Group.

2.4. The third meeting took place on 30 August 2012 with 34 members of the public in attendance, as shown in Figure 2, and the fourth meeting on 2 October 2014 with 22 public present. Again, site selection was at the heart of these meetings.

Figure 2: *Steering group meeting on 30 August 2012 with 34 members of the public present*



2.5. Emphasis on identifying possible housing sites

With much of the village attitude informed by the Village Design Statement consultation, the thrust of the Steering Group in these early stages was towards identifying possible sites for development adjacent to the existing village confines. This approach, which was to identify a possible single site for significant (in terms of Spratton's current built size) development was heavily influenced by discussions which were taking place between Spratton Parish Council representatives and Daventry District Council. At this time, a central plank of Daventry's eventual Settlements and Countryside Plan appeared to be the creation of a hierarchy of villages, with it likely that Spratton would be classified as a '7 percent village'. Thus, this early stage focussed on seeking to find a site or sites for 35 dwellings (7% of the existing housing stock of the Parish).

2.6. With the final Inspector's report on the West Northants Joint Core Strategy (published in October 2014) and whilst the concept of a hierarchy has survived, the classifications of sizes has been swept aside. However, this history serves to explain why much of the consultation was based around finding a site for 35 houses.



Figure 4. Three sites chosen for the November 2012 consultation



3.2. This consultation, taking place on the weekend of 17 and 18 November in the Village Hall, was advertised through a poster put up around the village and a six page document delivered to every dwelling in the village. This document also set out the background to and purpose of the consultation, being to seek parishioners views on the three sites chosen by the Steering Group. Questionnaires (hard copy or available online through Survey Monkey) were accompanied by a very detailed 17-page document explaining the background to each of the nine questions in the survey. 134 households, approx 27% of the parish, took part. The key findings were

- 3.2.1. 87 % of respondents were in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan process
- 3.2.2. 80% were against more infill.
- 3.2.3. 77% were in favour of more affordable housing.
- 3.2.4. Information was built up on the importance of and parishioners use of the various village facilities. The village primary school, Village stores, Pub, Butcher, Village Hall and Recreation Ground were all considered to be important (compared with other facilities such as the hairdresser and Sports & Social Club, and the importance

of these was largely reflected by responses as to whether parishioners used the facilities (obviously the primary school could not be included in the latter)

- 3.2.5. There was almost no support for Site A in Figure 4, west of the A5199, from which it became known that parishioners do not wish the village to expand in this direction (there are currently just a handful of separate houses on the west side of the A5199).
  - 3.2.6. On further examination of the Village design Statement, which had not yet been finalised, Site C was in conflict with views which parishioners wanted to see protected so was eliminated..
- 3.3. A landowner, the Gaywood family whose site had not been included, attended the meeting and tabled proposals, not seen before the consultation date, for his land, now sites 11 and 12. (In correspondence leading up to the consultation, there had been dialogue about increasing an original proposal – which had been door-dropped around the village – originally 1.65 acres to 4 acres, preferably not extending east of the Brixworth Road cemetery and possibly working with other land owners.) Concerns were expressed at the consultation about the inclusion of a relief road to Spratton Hall School which the site owner had indicated to be an almost agreed position with the School. However, the Neighbourhood Plan manager knew from discussions with that School that they were not likely to agree to such an arrangement – a position which was confirmed in writing by the school Governors in June 2014. A further letter was sent on 6 December 2012, which sought an assurance from the Gaywood family that a relief road to the Hall School would be a definite outcome, as was being inferred, via a letter of intent from the school (This was not then or later forthcoming). The letter also ‘warmly welcomed [him] to attend the next Parish Council meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2012’.
- 3.4. The Parish Council’s position on a large (35 houses) site was ambivalent as shown by the Minutes of its meeting of 18 December 2012 when the majority of councillors expressed themselves as not being in favour of a large site, nor of the Gaywood’s development which extended east of the Brixworth Road cemetery, seen as the natural limit of the village confine. However, the dichotomy at the time was that the Parish Council understood there to be an absolute need to include a significant site allocation within its emerging Neighbourhood Plan, with this also then being able to provide much needed affordable housing to address local needs. However, in the same Meeting it noted that the number of additional market houses which parishioners would support had not been addressed by a parishioner consultation. As a result it was decided to address this in a further consultation, which took place in March 2013.
- 3.5. The Gaywood site was part of a larger ownership, and subsequently they worked up a proposal on the larger 4 acre site which subsequently became one of two short-listed sites, carried forward to a further consultation in November 2013. The inclusion of the Gaywood site demonstrates the inclusivity that has been applied throughout this consultation.
- 3.6. Site B (Site 6 on the original map, Figure 3) had by then become combined with site 8 (these are in different ownerships) on the original map, creating another site capable of same 35 houses.
- 3.7. The results of the November 2012 consultation (see 3.2) were announced in March 2013 by door-drop to every house in the parish and in the Parish Newsletter with the attached

table, which shows the combined sites 6 + 8, and 11 + 12, to go forward to the next stage.

Site	Available	Why not	Suitable	Reason	Authority
1	Yes		No	West of A5199	Nov 2012 consultation
2	No	Allotments + not for sale			
3	Yes		No	West of A5199	Nov 2012 consultation
4	No	Rec. Ground			
5	No	Cemetery			
6	Yes		Yes	Forward with site 8	
7	Yes		No	Conflict with VDS views	
8	Yes		Yes	Forward with site 6	
9	No	Hall School			
10	No	Not for sale			
11	Yes		Yes	Forward with site 12	
12	Yes		Yes	Forward with site 11	
13	No	Cemetery			
14	No	Not for sale			
15	Yes		No	Conflict with VDS views	Nov 2012 consultation
16	No	Not for sale			
17			No	No access	
18	No	Not for sale			
19			No	Inadequate access	
20			No	Inadequate access	
21	Yes		Yes	Small scale only because of access	
22	Yes		No	Conflict with VDS views	
23			No	Inadequate access	
24			No	West of A5199	Nov 2012 consultation

#### 4. Steering Group

The Parish Council had realised for some time that it might need the help of an expert to advise on and formulate its Plan. Preliminary discussions had taken place with Navigus Planning late in 2011, but no formal advice or appointment had been made by the end of 2012. In the meantime the Parish Council had applied for and been successful in obtaining a grant from Awards for All, for the preparation of its Plan, for £10,000 late that year. The Steering Group had, mainly through its meeting on 2 October 2012, made excellent progress on a brief for a housing policy for the Plan (and other matters), and had set up and run the first consultation in November 2012. In view of the grant, the Parish Council would be required to be responsible for approving and monitoring the grant expenditure, so it became necessary for it to take the lead in the process. As the Parish Council now had an excellent brief from the work of the Steering Group, and was also informed by the Village Design Statement (undergoing its last stages of approval at Daventry District Council) as well as the November 2012 consultation, it appeared that it would now be mainly a question of administering the process and its technicalities (and the grant), more expediently done by the Parish Council. So, the Steering group was thanked and stood down. [It is clear from the notes of a meeting with Navigus in December 2012 that the Parish Council severely underestimated the difficulties of preparing such a Plan, difficulties which only the Parish Council, in a position of authority, could have handled.]

5. Consultation March 2013

5.1. Included with the circulation of the results of the November 2012 consultation were details of a further consultation to take place in March 2013. In order to try and make these consultations more accessible, this was held in three separate locations at three different times and dates:

- 5.1.1. Sunday March 17<sup>th</sup> 3.00 pm in the Church, refreshments available free
- 5.1.2. Tuesday March 19<sup>th</sup> 6.00 pm in the Village Hall, ahead of the Parish Council meeting
- 5.1.3. Thursday March 21<sup>st</sup> 7.30 pm in the Sports & Social Club

5.2. The purpose of this consultation was to get parishioners views on the extent of market housing expansion that they would want to see over the period of the Plan, up until 2026 (the Plan period was later changed to 2029). This specific question had not been asked in the previous consultation.

5.3. Despite the wider consultative approach, only 70 households (14% of the parish number) responded. Most said that they were likely to continue to live in Spratton.

5.4. Asked about size and type of housing, there was little support for the larger 4- and 5-bedroom properties. Most people did not think that a (relatively) few new houses would make any difference to the vitality of the retail businesses in the village, but considered that new housing should comprise the smaller and more affordable types for young families so as to support the Primary School. In terms of the number of market houses that parishioners would like to see over the Plan period, the responses were as shown below

<b>How many new houses in Plan period</b>	<b>Number of votes</b>
None	1
0-10	12
11-25	25
26-40	18
41-70	2
71+	2
Did not complete this question	2

5.5. Examination of the above suggested a limited (because of the poor turnout) consensus of some 20-25 market houses , which with 12 affordable homes, appeared to support a site for 35 units, as one option for satisfying the housing requirement in the Plan.

6. Consultation November 2013

6.1. Further deliberations by the Parish Council led to a proposal to have a further consultation, aimed at making a decision between the two sites that now remained as candidates for development of 35 houses. The consultation was originally planned for October, but had to be delayed to November, this being announced in the September 2013 Newsletter, put on the Parish Council website and advised by door-drop to every household. In addition, six large 6-foot posters were placed around the village, as shown in Figure 5

Figure 5: *One of the 6-foot posters on display in the village outside the Primary School*



6.2. In view of the fact that there were two very similar proposals, it was decided to establish a protocol to guide the process of allocating a site, which needed to take into account the benefits offered by each scheme to the community. This was agreed by both site promoters.

6.3. The site choice was as shown by Figure 6

Figure 6. *Site choice for the November 2013 consultation*

## Approximate locations of Sites 1 and 2



- A Recreation Ground
- B East View Cemetery
- C Brixworth Road Pocket Park/Cemetery

6.4. The consultation took place in the Village Hall over the weekend of 17 and 18 November 2013, as shown below in Figure 7:

Figure 7: Consultation 17 and 18 November 2013 in the Village Hall



- 6.5. This consultation was run on an electoral basis, with consultees signing in against the electoral register in order to receive their consultation response forms. 210 parishioners, 22% of those on the register came to the Hall
- 6.6. The purpose of this consultation was to seek opinions on a wide variety of aspects of each of the two proposals, as well as on the community benefits that each was proposing. A straight site choice question was not asked, as it was considered vital that the process was able to demonstrate which site, in the opinion of the parishioners, would provide the greatest level of community benefit to Spratton. A site choice would have been more likely to show people's subjective preference based on how one or the other site might affect their own property or outlook
- 6.7. Some of the matters on which opinion were sought were
- 6.7.1. The benefit of a possible relief road to Spratton Hall School, a 400-head private preparatory school, to take traffic away from the village streets. Many representations made at the time of the Village Plan and Design Statement process had referred to the congestion and speeding caused by drop-offs to the school. The Parish Council was also aware of many other representations over the years about traffic down Smith Street, along School Road and along the very narrow Manor Road at drop-off times, consistent with the around 400 day pupils at the school. There had also been a public meeting many years before when a large numbers of villagers had sought to pressurise the Hall School into finding a solution for the traffic through the village.

- 6.7.2. The benefit of a remote drop-off point to the Primary School, removing the hazard of dropping at the school gates in a busy village street, which was offered by one of the sites.
- 6.7.3. The effect on views, many 'protected' by the Village Design Statement, of both sites.
- 6.8. It was hoped that this would enable the Parish Council, on behalf of parishioners to quickly gauge which of the two sites was favoured by a majority. However, the Parish Council had to step back from the announcement to this effect in the December 2013 Newsletter, for the result of very detailed analysis and interpretation showed that the village appeared to be evenly divided in its preference (or possibly dislike of) each of the sites. One of the key benefits which had been flagged up by an earlier consultation was a possible link road to Spratton Hall School, which would partially relieve traffic within the narrow and congested village streets. In the event, the School would not support one of the link road proposals, for operational and security reasons, with the Governor's reporting in their letter of 12 June that 'the Gaywood site is unworkable'. The Gaywood site was the site east of the village and north of the Brixworth Road. Significant feedback on the other potential new link road came from residents of Smith Street (one of the affected village streets) who felt that a development opposite them, on the other side of the Recreation Ground, was too high a price to pay.
- 6.9. On 5 March 2014, the Parish Council called an extraordinary meeting to update parishioners on the status of the November 2013 consultation. About 80 members of the public attended, so this took the form of another, but limited, consultation. Some of the key matters put to the meeting
- 6.9.1. Parishioners had indicated in the November 2013 consultation that both sites were equally suitable.
- 6.9.2. Deliverability was much harder. The Parish Council had to make a judgement if a site would be delivered with the benefits and need to be sure that the maths was correct. The PC had to engage with promoters to ascertain and negotiate for the benefits.
- 6.9.3. Ultimately it would fall to the Parish Council to make a decision on deliverability as the benefits of each site were more or less equal.
- 6.9.4. The implications of the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy from 1 April 2015.
- 6.9.5. The aspiration of the Parish Council for a new Village Hall.
- In the public session which followed, there was no challenge to point 6.9.1. Much of the detailed points raised related to highways issues which the Parish Council commented were outside its remit.
- The Parish Council resolved to defer a decision on allocation of a site in the plan, noting that, whilst a site choice might have to be decided by further public consultation, however that this would be a "lottery".

Figure 8. *The extraordinary meeting of 5 March 2014*



6.10. The remaining community benefits were not substantial, and certainly did not provide an imperative to choose the allocation of a major site as the means of dealing with housing growth over the Plan period. It also had become clear to the Parish Council that a choice of either of the sites might not have sufficient support such that the Plan might fail at Referendum. For, if each site had equal support, this meant that only 11% of parishioners appeared to support the one or the other site, leaving a large majority who might well oppose a Plan with either of the two sites allocated.

6.11. With the benefit of information from the judicial review decision made on 12 May 2014 in respect of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, it now became an option to promote a Plan with a pro-growth housing policy but without a specific site allocation. Once this information became known to the Parish Council, it decided to consider whether to proceed without a site allocation and advice was sought, via a briefing note dated 15 July 2014 from Daventry District Council, who advised that parishioner opinion would have to support such a change. It was therefore resolved by the Parish Council to test opinion as to whether parishioners would prefer a site allocation of one of the major sites or would prefer slower more organic growth with no sites allocated but a more flexible approach to any sites adjacent to the settlement boundary which may come forward over the plan period. The promoter protocol was suspended pending the outcome of this.

## 7. September 2014 consultation

- 7.1. A further consultation was therefore agreed, this taking place again on an electoral basis with individual questionnaires being delivered to every elector at the end of August 2014, with a closing date for responses of 27 September 2014. The questionnaire was supported by a 4-page background document which summarised the process to date and detailed the now-limited community benefit considerations, so that people could make an informed response. It also explained carefully the background to the potential change in direction from a site allocation to no site allocation (this only to be made if there was parishioner support).
- 7.2. Although a very simple question was being asked, the questionnaire was meticulously drafted through 13 or more versions before being signed off by the Parish Council. There was one main question, which was whether parishioners wanted to see the housing policy of the Plan based on a single site of 35 houses, or whether more gradual growth was preferred. (This has happened over the recent history of the village, with the housing stock rising by 28 units between 2001 and 2011, and already some 12 houses having been built since 2011). It is important to note that of the three options given on the questionnaire, the first tick box was 'I would prefer to see one large scheme of say 35 homes', avoiding any challenge that the questionnaire was 'leading' and seeking to influence parishioners towards the option of slower growth which was the second of the tick boxes in the questionnaire.
- 7.3. There was an excellent response rate of 31.5% of electors, 289 individuals, after eliminating duplicates and spoiled papers. The majority opinion, of 61.8% of parishioners, preferred a policy of more gradual growth on unidentified sites, rather than the single site approach. A secondary question sought to identify the upper limit of houses per site, these sites being either within the village confines (to be defined in the Plan), or immediately adjacent to this village confine. The conclusion of this was that an upper limit of around 10 dwellings per site should form part of the policy.
- 7.4. As a result of this consultation, the pro-growth housing policy was changed from this being met by a single site to slower and more organic growth. Consequently the suspended promoter protocol was abandoned, as the Plan was to no longer include a site allocation.
8. Hard-to-reach groups
- 8.1. The consultations were, with one exception when evenings were tried, held at the weekends so as to enable as many people as possible to attend. As a result, they have engaged well with about a quarter of parishioners. The two consultations based on the electoral register showed returns from every street in the parish. The number of returns was generally equivalent numerically to about 50 percent of the number of dwellings in each street. However, because of the shape, form and topography of the built village, many parishioners considered that they were unlikely to be affected by the proposals. When a possible site allocation was being considered, this only affected residents in two of the peripheral sectors, the north and east, so the remainder (a further at least 20 percent of dwellings) were able to consider that the proposals would not affect them. So, more than half of parishioners have probably considered the proposals of no impact, and thus of no interest. Much of the post-World-War2 development took place in an extension of the village to the west towards the A5199 in what is now effectively an inner-built area, with some one-third of all dwellings. Thus there were lower percentage returns from the following streets, Glebelands, Gorse Road, Holdenby Road, Orchard

Close, Sandhills and St Luke's Close, all of which are later development within this inner-built area. The cheaper and the Social Housing is to be found largely in this area which contains a much higher percentage of people unlikely to be affected by any of the Plan proposals. Only those on the extremities of the village enjoy views over the surrounding countryside and these people were obviously more inclined to get involved if they thought that these would be affected, and this shows up with higher response rates in some of these areas.

8.2. Nevertheless the Parish Council has persevered in its attempts to reach all parishioners. The main approach has been to door drop every household in connection with each consultation. In addition, the quarterly Parish Council newsletter has contained regular updates. The November 2012 and November 2013 consultations were held in the village hall, and this was well advertised, including posters around the village. For the March 2013 consultation, as already reported above, the Parish Council sought to make these consultations more accessible by holding meetings in three different locations on three different days and at three different times of day.

## 9. Pre-submission consultation

- 9.1. Again, individual door-drops to every household were carried out advising people of this stage and how and where they could study the Plan. Copies were placed in the only two publicly open meeting places, the Kings Head public house and the Church coffee shop. A further copy was placed in the Library of the neighbouring village, Brixworth some 2½ miles away. In order to give parishioners access to councillors to explain any aspect of the Plan, councillor surgeries were arranged on a pre-booked appointment basis for Saturday November 8, 1000-1300 and 1400-1600 hours and November 22, 1400-1600 hours, and information on these was included in the door-drop. Unfortunately, no parishioner took up the offer to either book an appointment, nor did any arrive without an appointment as there was a councillor present at the start of each session and on standby to respond to any telephone call in response to a notice of the meeting room door.
- 9.2. On 28 November 2014 and during the consultation period, central government changed the threshold for the requirement for affordable units from developments of 5 units to those with more than 10 units. The West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, adopted in December 2014, maintains the lower limit. On advice, it was decided that this Neighbourhood Plan had to reflect the probability that that this PPG note would become a requirement, over-riding the WNJCS policy. Accordingly, a new policy was introduced (para 5.7) whereby the previous limit of any individual development permitted by the Plan should be increased from 10 to 15 units, with provisions which seek to prevent landowners and developers of limiting such developments to 10 units so as to avoid having to build affordable units.
- 9.3. There were responses from statutory consultees as follows, Daventry District Council, Northamptonshire County Council Highways, English Heritage and Spratton Primary School. One of the promoters of 'Site 2', one of the two sites no longer allocated made lengthy representations. There were 45 responses with specific comments from parishioners. But, in addition, 21 people signed a 'petition', and 79 others indicated their opposition to the Plan when approached by the landowners of Site 2. It is known from talking to some of the respondents that some of these representations were based on a, possibly deliberate, doorstep interpretation of policies in the Plan, particularly the one relating to protection of distinctive walls.. Since no comment on the form was made, and others found much to comment on, it is a reasonable assumption that these responses

were not based on proper study and understanding of the Plan and its policies. (The 'walls' policy protects all 'Existing locally distinctive old cob, stone and brick boundary walls and buildings, thatched and slate roofs', so. no Plan is required. The Plan in the earlier section 8, used to define views only, will be replaced by the version intended, which does not have any walls marked.)

- 9.4. The representations from all the statutory consultees led to a significant number of changes to the Plan, and Spratton Parish Council found, as a result of the process, changes and additions that it had not previously considered. On the other hand, the great majority of the parishioner representations were more of a protest, particularly (as might be expected) from the family of the Site 2 landowner. Other than those raised by the statutory consultees, the substantive issues (leaving aside errors and omissions correctly identified) raised by parishioners, and which have been accepted, related to
  - 9.4.1. The need for policies of the Plan to safeguard existing community facilities
  - 9.4.2. References to a new village hall being broadened to 'community facilities'.
  - 9.4.3. More significance given to the importance to the community of the Primary school, albeit no policy changes.
  - 9.4.4. The addition of a policy in respect of existing and any future safe walking routes, especially relating to Primary School pupils.
  - 9.4.5. Inclusion of a policy requiring developments to meet the requirements of the Northamptonshire Highways Manual For Streets.

## 10. Pre-submission consultation representations and responses

Within the representations certain allegations have been made against Parish Council which have as a result of legal advice been redacted.

Name	Pg	Section	Representation	Response
M. Heaton	27	7.8 line 4	Parishioners spelt incorrectly	
	27	7.8	Revise text to show demonstrate why Jubilee Wood is special,	New wording agreed <i>The land for Jubilee Wood has a public footpath running through it and was made available by a landowner to create a community facility of the only accessible wood in the parish. It was planted by parishioners in 2012 for the enjoyment of future generations and also to provide biodiversity benefits. Jubilee Wood is maintained by 'Natural Spratton', a group affiliated to Spratton Parish Council, and is enjoyed on a daily basis by parishioners.</i>
M. Heaton	50	12.1	Delete Post Office	
B. Foster	5	Proposals map	That her property has been 'cut in half' and should all be included per Land Registry holding	The village settlement boundary in the Proposals Map will be explained better.
C. Richardson			<i>Just ticked 'support'</i>	
J. Hinds			<i>Just ticked 'support'</i>	
M. Benn	5	2.1	As Spratton village has been in the form of a "cluster" since the 9 <sup>th</sup> C, what right have we to consider significant expansion outside the existing cluster? It would be tragic if, in the 21 <sup>st</sup> C we should allow this heritage and principle to be violated after 1200 years. Long Buckby we ain't, and should not be permitted to expand in that manner.	The distinction between the parish boundary, which has remained unchanged and the settlement boundary needs to be made. The words in the penultimate sentence 'and a few houses have been built in the west' to ' <i>and the village underwent considerable expansion from the 1930s onwards.</i> ' The last sentence in 2.1 is wrong and will be deleted.
	7	2.13	The variations of age structure between Spratton and the Daventry District as recorded are not statistically significant.	Noted

	15	5.7	Limit to 10 including “Affordable” must be unchallengeable and stressed as such. Absolutely not more.	Because of the change in government policy on the affordable threshold (now raised from 5 to 10 units in a development), the new housing policy will have an upper limit of 15 units. This cannot be ‘absolute’.
	16	5.9	Agree in principle but how can “in perpetuity” be enforced? Will a Local Lettings Policy be put in place by Daventry District Council, and when?	DDC has or will have a Local Lettings Policy and so if it does, we will have a lot greater opportunity to ensure that new affordable units are offered first to people with a local connection. In a perfect world these units would be held in perpetuity for local people but this is often quite difficult to achieve. However, this is something that the community has considered to be important and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan has sought to marshal the evidence in order to justify its inclusion in Policy HS1. Discuss with Daventry District Council
	23	6.9	No mention of potential expansion of the units on Holdenby Road below Broomhill, nor of the Broomhill development which will involve substantial employment little or none from Spratton and certainly much increased traffic. A policy should be included in the plan to preclude any expansion of the latter (or similar schemes) beyond that for which existing planning permission has been granted.	Expansion of any existing employment or commercial areas outside the settlement boundary is not supported by this Plan. There may be an exception to the Matts complex, but this policy is under review with Daventry District Council.
	46	10.9	New pavements should be resisted as a further encroachment of urbanisation of the village. This policy is misguided and should be deleted. How many injuries in Spratton have occurred because of lack of pavements? Indeed in many places these are being purposely removed to ensure lower traffic speeds. Holland, Exhibition Road, Dorchester etc. A good case could be made for removing them on Brixworth Road to reduce speeds in the narrow section between School Road and the Memorial Garden	Not agreed.

	47	10.11	Difficult to rely on sufficient funds from this source if restricted to contributions from developments in the village. Alternative sources essential.	Funding is not a Neighbourhood Plan issue.
	49	RE1 Objective 2	Should include reference to Views.	Not relevant, this is a section on Renewable energy.
	50	12.3	It lacks a “village hall commensurate with the size of and demand from residents” (It already has a village hall as in earlier para, & many would say that this is quite adequate for the PC!)	Agreed. Wording changes: Page 22, para 6.3 Change ‘village hall’ in last sentence to ‘community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’ and delete after the word ‘development’. Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from ‘new village hall’ to ‘new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’. Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after ‘community infrastructure’ to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1.</i> Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.’</i>

D. Cooke	3	1.6	JSC report should have been available mid-2014 and any implications incorporated into this document.	It is a requirement and they will be.
	13	4.3	This appears to make all areas adjoining the settlement boundary available for development without qualification except a limit of ten dwellings per development in 4.4.	Correct
	13	4.4	There is no excuse for encouraging Spratton Hall School to expand their operation or to give them a special mention. They are the source of traffic congestion in the village and seem able to get DDC's agreement to whatever they want to do without assistance from the Parish Council	The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.
	13	4.4	The comment about pupil numbers at the school is meaningless as the number of pupils is not stated. Even if it was it would be unenforceable and ignored. Previously, when there were less than 390 pupils, the School gave an undertaking, as part of a planning application, not to increase numbers and hence traffic. I believe the current roll is 460.	The school have advised us that they are within the limit of 402 pupils set in the 1999 planning consent, DA/99/0770., and this will be added in the Plan. We have been given to understand that the current number is nearer 400 but the Parish Council will seek confirmation
	13	4.4	Also the School hire their facilities to other schools and they arrive on large coaches that are unsuitable for the roads. Any new building on this site involves introducing more traffic into an already difficult situation.	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue
	13	4.4	With this in the Plan there is no way the Parish Council will be able to object to any planning application the school may make in the future.	The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.
	13	4.4	The School have always refused to acknowledge their responsibility for the traffic problems they cause in the village or cooperate in any way to mitigate the difficulty. There is no sign this will change.	A new section will be added to Section 13 of the Plan headed 'Highways'. <i>There are a number of unsatisfactory issues relating to high volumes of traffic in the village, HGV's using the Brixworth Road as a through route, and insufficient rural bus services. The Parish Council will engage with the relevant parties, agencies or providers to seek improvement to these matters, including a specific approach to the issue of the narrow road above Sauls.'</i>

	15	5.7	This restricts new development to the settlement area in conflict with 4.3. JCS plan should be available and numbers known. Also why state that Social Housing may be outside the Settlement Boundary when 4.3 and 5.7 clearly allow all developments to be outside the boundary?	Agreed. The wording in 5.3 needs to be changed to ‘within and adjacent to...’
	15	5.7	This restricts the size of developments to 10 dwellings but not the number of developments. Why?	The plan needs to provide flexibility for sustainable growth. With the option of allocating a site no longer justifiable, this approach provides flexibility. In reality it is not considered likely that there will be lots of sites coming forward because many of the areas around the village have specific issues with delivering a housing scheme.
	26	Green spaces	Surely the wood on Rolly Banks should be listed. It is in private ownership in the same way as Jubilee Wood. Also East View Cemetery could be included.	There is a specific arrangement with the landowner re Jubilee Wood, we are not aware that such arrangement (for access and enjoyment) exists for Rolybanks. East View Cemetery in not considered relevant for inclusion.
	40	8.17	“Lighting in the Countryside: Towards Good Practice” is not well known and is out of print. If Contractors and Developers are to find it, it needs to be clarified that it was published in 1997 by Department of Communities and Local Government and can to found online. It will cross reference with-out-off date standards as BS EN 13201-2 is now 2003.	Agreed. It is proposed that more up to date guidance is referenced. This is guidance from the Institute of Lighting Engineers (Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution 2000)
	45	Traffic	The traffic congestion caused in the streets around Spratton Hall School was clearly identified in a village questionnaire in connection with the Plan as a major concern to residents and an improvement in the situation was a priority. It has been completely ignored. This issue needs to be clearly stated in the Plan (Objective 6).  In the same way as development is to be limited to reduce	A new section will be added to Section 13 of the Plan headed ‘Highways’. <i>There are a number of unsatisfactory issues relating to high volumes of traffic in the village, HGV’s using the Brixworth Road as a through route, and insufficient rural bus services. The Parish Council will engage with the relevant parties, agencies or providers to seek improvement to these matters, including a specific approach to the issue of the narrow road above Sauls.</i> There is a parking standard see paras 10.3, 10.4 and Policy

			parking on verges a policy is needed to prevent any development that will exasperate the situation that already exists.	HP1.
	50	12.1	The Post Office was closed a number of years ago	Noted and will be deleted
	50	12.3 12.4	This is a surprise. It is not so long ago that the Parish Council decided the Village did not need a Parish Hall and spent the money that was available at that time on repairs to the existing wooden structure built in 1927!	It was not the Parish Council which decided this, and this aspiration was reported at a well-attended extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 5 March 2014. Agreed. Wording changes: Page 22, para 6.3 Change ‘village hall’ in last sentence to ‘community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’ and delete after the word ‘development’. Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from ‘new village hall’ to ‘new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’. Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after ‘community infrastructure’ to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i> . Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.’</i>
	52	13.5	It is unfortunate that both the original proposed	With the benefit of information from the judicial review

			developments were rejected as both had potential, with thoughtful design, to incorporate measures to slow traffic coming into the village.	decision made on 12 May 2014 in respect of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, it now became an option to promote a Plan with a pro-growth housing policy but without a specific site allocation. Once this information became known to the Parish Council, it decided to consider whether to proceed without a site allocation and advice was sought, via a briefing note dated 15 July 2014 from Daventry District Council, who advised that parishioner opinion would have to support such a change. It was therefore resolved by the Parish Council to test opinion as to whether parishioners would prefer a site allocation of one of the major sites or would prefer slower more organic growth with no sites allocated but a more flexible approach to any sites adjacent to the settlement boundary which may come forward over the plan period. The promoter protocol was suspended pending the outcome of this.
J. Gaywood			72.14 PLANNING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Chair: Councillor Fiona Keable 2/. How can it be that S.P.C. get to choose an independent adjudicator. In my opinion if a body has a say in who is going to inspect them, then the inspection is far from independent, is it not? It might be the right of the Council to do this under the rules, this I can't argue, as I don't know.	DDC are required to submit a form to NPIERS who provide up to 3 names of examiners to be selected from by DDC and SPC, see <a href="http://www.rics.org/Global/NPIERS1%20Application%20Form.pdf">http://www.rics.org/Global/NPIERS1%20Application%20Form.pdf</a> See also <a href="http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/the-independent-examination/">http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/the-independent-examination/</a>
			[Nine other sections redacted on legal advice]	
R. Humphries (ex Spratton Resident)			I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the Spratton Neighbourhood Plan process. Along with the impact this may have on the private planning application made for 37 houses off Brixworth road. Growing up I was a parishioner at Spratton for 20 years leaving the village around 5 years ago and would relish the opportunity to move back in to the village. Due to this I	The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.

		have been following the developments of the neighbourhood plan.	
		<p>In my opinion, it is clear to see from the consistent bias and leading questionnaires and bulletins that the plan is not robust. For the vast majority of the process parishioners were consulting on two sites that were selected based on the information learnt from previous consultations regarding what the parishioners wanted to achieve from the plan.</p> <p>To my understanding all parties had agreed to a written protocol. This protocol, composed by the parish council and their advisors was then broken by the parish council before completion. It is my understanding that the protocol stated that if consultation regarding the two sites was to close to determine the outcome a site specific vote would follow.</p> <p>It is my educated opinion from following this process closely that this site specific vote was avoided due to the likelihood of it bringing about the result that the parish council have so clearly attempted to steer the village away from. This being the allocation of site two for development.</p> <p>The people of Spratton have identified in previous consultation that they would like to see around 35 new houses. The parish council is now leading parishioners towards "organic growth". Spratton have now consulted on this with no information regarding a technical study to determine whether it is possible to incorporate the growth required in this style.</p> <p>The way I see it, Spratton parish council have spent a lot of money and achieved absolutely nothing.</p>	<p>With the benefit of information from the judicial review decision made on 12 May 2014 in respect of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, it now became an option to promote a Plan with a pro-growth housing policy but without a specific site allocation. Once this information became known to the Parish Council, it decided to consider whether to proceed without a site allocation and advice was sought, via a briefing note dated 15 July 2014 from Daventry District Council, who advised that parishioner opinion would have to support such a change. It was therefore resolved by the Parish Council to test opinion as to whether parishioners would prefer a site allocation of one of the major sites or would prefer slower more organic growth with no sites allocated but a more flexible approach to any sites adjacent to the settlement boundary which may come forward over the plan period. The promoter protocol was suspended pending the outcome of this.</p>
		They have conducted numerous consultations, that have all	This is incorrect. The only consultation which gave a

			bar one had positive responses to larger schemes.	choice was the September 2014 one, and respondents to the September 2014 consultation rejected larger schemes by a significant majority
			<p>We have now seen a sudden injection of impetuosity in my opinion to block a private application. This is surely not the mandate set out by creating a neighbourhood plan? The way I understand it, you are supposed to consult with the parishioners to determine a clear and robust plan. When considering the whole process and results from a variety of consultations, you are not in a position to make a recommendation to the village as the results from the latest leading questionnaire are no more definitive than previous results.</p> <p>In the committee report I noticed the latest consultation results had been published within the document, I was of the understanding that the neighbourhood plan and private application were two separate matters? If this is incorrect, will you be considering that the private application received a far larger amount of letters of support than letters of objection within the neighbourhood plan?</p>	The private application is not a Neighbourhood Plan issue and has been refused by Daventry District Council
			Across this process the need for affordable housing in Spratton has been one of the main aspects for consideration. In my opinion, this should not be thrown to the wayside based on the results of one consultation from a leading questionnaire.	See the answer to your first point re affordable housing
			I would like to see more consultation done with informative non-biased bulletins that allow people to make their own minds up, along with questionnaires that do not lead parishioners but seek their opinion in order to lead you to a plan that will bring about what people truly want.	The consultation has involved four consultations already, and many parishioners are consultation-weary, but we do not see any such further need.
Mr and Mrs Woods	36	8.9	It says that the view to Brixworth and its spire are particularly important but the map at 8.1 does not show an	The map and arrows are sourced from the Village Design Statement based on an earlier consultation. The map has

			arrow pointing directly to the east with specific comment	been used as a starting point and may be amended as and when the plan is reviewed.
B. Frenchman	11	3.1	Replace demography with <i>Demographics</i>	Agreed
	13	4.3	But subject to DDC planning policies	Not necessary to state this
	13	4.4	As only developments over 5 (currently) have affordable housing element perhaps we should have a policy of numbers of affordables	Affordable housing policy is set by DDC so we cannot have a policy on the number of affordable units.
	13	4.4	Actually put a number to pupil limit	The school have advised us that they are within the limit of 402 pupils set in the 1999 planning consent, DA/99/0770., and this will be added in the Plan. We have been given to understand that the current number is nearer 400 but the Parish Council will seek confirmation
	15 /1 6	5.8 HS1	To require developments of 5 or more units to provide affordable units	Due to a change in government policy, para 5.7 will be changed to read: <i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no</i>

				<p><i>on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>
	23	Sec. 6	Other employment areas e.g. Hawthorn Park to be mentioned	Para 6.7 covers this issue
	47	10.11	Daventry District Council may only spend CIL money on ‘qualifying projects’.	Agreed, words to be added
	50	12.1	Hall school added to Community facilities	Agreed, but will be stated as the ‘Facilities of Spratton Hall School’.
	52	13	Policies to be added on rural transport and any aspirations on this	A new section will be added to Section 13 of the Plan headed ‘Highways’. <i>There are a number of unsatisfactory issues relating to high volumes of traffic in the village, HGV’s using the Brixworth Road as a through route, and insufficient rural bus services. The Parish Council will engage with the relevant parties, agencies or providers to seek improvement to these matters, including a specific approach to the issue of the narrow road above Sauls.’</i>
R. Woodgate	15	5.7	Regarding the maximum 10 houses that will be allowed in any one development should there be an additional note regarding the infrastructure to support any such development ie that the existing road that the proposed development would spur off from can support the additional entry/exit point. That additional road traffic will not impair the rights of existing residents. that any additional street lighting required will not impose on	It is not the job of this Plan to bolster Planning and Highways Policies

			existing residents.	
	17	5.14	Could there be an additional bullet point ..."Loss of natural stone walls that have formed a natural and continuous boundary ".	Protection is given to these in para 9.3 and the penultimate point in Policy HD1 (both page 43). Loss of distinctive cob, stone and brick boundary walls' will be added to the list of adverse impacts in section 5.14 on page 17.
	18	5.20	Suggested additional point . "Where a new build is replacing an existing building, the footprint should remain the same or smaller , and the maximum height of the new build should remain the same or less, as the building to be replaced ".	This is not sustainable under Planning Law
	35	Objective 3	Proposed additional sentence. ".....including existing trees and foliage where they have previously formed a natural feature of the street scene "	We already have policies to protect green spaces of value to the community (Policy LG1). If trees require protection then the most appropriate method is via a tree preservation order.
	48		Could this section (HP2) merit inclusion of Northamptonshire Highways Manual For Streets requirements eg. "Developments should meet minimum highways visibility requirements at any proposed access points ie visibility splays of 25 metres in either direction . "Entrance and exit points of any proposed driveway must meet Northamptonshire Design Guidance for New Developments ie must be at least 4 metres from any existing entrance/exit".	The Manual for Streets is standard guidance which is used by the highway authority. Having a policy would be unnecessary.
	48	1st para	Could there be a general point made in the opening paragraph on Page 48 relating to the Councils desire to improve footpath safety for children and parents walking to /from school. eg "The council wishes to encourage parents in the village to walk their children to school to avoid road congestion in the village. Any developments that include car access that could potentially cause visibility issues for footpath traffic will be strongly resisted."	Agreed. Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i>

E. Jarvis	11	Vision 3.1	<p>“Demography – an ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families”.</p> <p>I feel that the primary school and its needs should be mentioned in this section concerning ‘Vision’. It is a vital parish facility to keep the village alive and vibrant (phrase used on page 8). We need to do all that we can to increase the numbers of young families in the village.</p>	<p>Agreed, add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demography, Agreed. Add the words in italics</p> <p>An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school.</i></p>
	12	3.3	<p>“Provide new community facilities to address identified needs of the community”. I feel strongly that present community facilities like the village school should be supported as well as providing new ones. (See my detailed comments on 12.5 on page 50)</p>	<p>Agreed. Add words in italics</p> <p>‘Provide new community facilities <i>and support existing community facilities</i> to address identified needs of the community’.</p>
	13	Boundary 4.4	<p>It is unnecessary to mention the independent school and protect its needs, when no mention has been made of the village’s own school.</p>	<p>Agreed. The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.</p>
	14	Policy SB1	<p>Objective 4: “Developments should meet the needs of the local community.”</p> <p>This Neighbourhood Plan completely ignores the needs of the primary school. The large housing estate known as Site 2 offered extra parking spaces, drainage of school field and a small piece of extra land as well as houses for young families. All this has been ignored and disappeared in the draft neighbourhood plan</p>	<p>Any change to Objective 4 specific to the Primary School would be unrealistic to enforce through any policy. Any such policy would have to apply to all planning applications and for most, it would be almost impossible for them to demonstrate that they have considered the needs of the Primary School and have sought to protect them.</p>
	15	Housing 5.5	<p>This does not reflect village views adequately. NO VOTE was allowed or taken on which of the two larger sites of houses was preferred. Assumptions were made by the Parish Council that the village was 50% in favour of one and 50% in favour of the other</p>	<p>With the benefit of information from the judicial review decision made on 12 May 2014 in respect of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, it became an option to promote a Plan with a pro-growth housing policy but without a specific site allocation. Once this information became known to the Parish Council, it decided to consider whether to proceed without a site allocation and advice was sought, via a briefing note dated 15 July 2014 from</p>

				<p>Daventry District Council, who advised that parishioner opinion would have to support such a change. It was therefore resolved by the Parish Council to test opinion as to whether parishioners would prefer a site allocation of one of the major sites or would prefer slower more organic growth with no sites allocated but a more flexible approach to any sites adjacent to the settlement boundary which may come forward over the plan period. The promoter protocol was suspended pending the outcome of this. The outcome was that a significant majority of those participating in the September 2014 consultation rejected allocation of either of the larger site</p>
	15	5.7	<p>“The community has clearly indicated...” NO VOTE was taken on the large housing sites, only on the second proposition. A clever piece of political manoeuvring</p>	See above
	15	5.8	<p>“ the provision of affordable housing as part of any proposed housing development is a critical issue...” Agreed. Affordable housing is important to increase the number of young families. Will this be possible with small housing developments.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, on 28 November 2014, central government changed the threshold at which there is a requirement to deliver affordable units from 5 to 10. A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read. <i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National</i></p>

				<p><i>Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>
	46	Highways 10.8 10.9	Pedestrian movement: There should be mention made of primary school children in this section. It is vital that safe routes to school are considered when new houses are being built.	Agreed, but this should apply to all residents. Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, ‘ <i>Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.</i> ’
	46	Highways 10.8 10.9	There is considerable concern about the safety of children walking from any new houses near to Smith street to the primary school. There is not pavement, a dangerous sharp corner and the entrance to the independent school to be crossed at a time when many cars are on the road.	Following the decision not to allocate either of the sites, there are currently no development proposals. This will be considered if and when there are as part of the planning process.
	47	10.10	I find it surprising that footpaths have a whole paragraph, yet the safety of children walking in the street is ignored	See 2 points above
	50	12.1 12.2	This is the only mention made of the village school in the whole plan – in a list of facilities. It is important, in order that Spratton continues to be a vibrant and functioning	Agreed, Add after ‘possible’ at end of first sentence in 12.2 ‘especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.

			village, that it retains its community facilities where possible, and this should be stressed.,	
	50	12.3	<p>“What the village lacks at present is a village hall”  This is inaccurate, not to mention offensive to those who worked long and hard to update the WI hall to a village hall in Sept 2006 and also to Mrs Sheila Bradshaw who provided a very large amount of money.  “The current meeting facility used by the Parish Council” – the large board outside the hall states quite clearly, VILLAGE HALL, not ‘meeting facility’. Other organisation use it as well as the Parish Council. This seems to have been written by someone who does not know the village. Agreed that the kitchen needs updating and refurbishing.</p>	<p>This aspiration was reported at a well-attended extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 5 March 2014  Agreed. Wording changes:  Page 22, para 6.3 Change ‘village hall’ in last sentence to ‘community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’ and delete after the word ‘development’.  Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from ‘new village hall’ to ‘new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’.  Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after ‘community infrastructure’ to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i>.  Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with  <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.’</i></p>
	50	12.4	<p>“There is considered to be a need for a dedicated village hall to serve the community of Spratton”. Where has this idea suddenly come from? It has not been proposed at any</p>	<p>This aspiration was reported at a well-attended extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 5 March 2014. The Minute books show that it was first discussed in</p>

			of the village consultations that have been held.	1950.
	50	12.5	In 2005-6 much work was done by a committee of villagers chaired by Adrian Baker, to provide a new village hall on the Recreation Field – even as far as hiring an architect and approving plans. We finally found we could not access any grant money because <u>we could not establish a need</u> in the village. There were two main reasons given – 1) Societies and clubs wanted to keep using their own halls e.g. W.I., Scouts, Social Club, 2) The Recreation ground was too far for people to walk, older people and young mothers with prams said that they would not use it. The playgroup preferred to stay near the primary school. The present site in the centre of the village was much preferred. If clubs wanted a larger venue, they used the primary school hall, the King’s head or Spratton Hall School hall. We now also have the Church with its new kitchen and toilet facilities. This is increasingly used for functions and meetings.	See above
			Finally, I am sorry that village children, their safety needs and their school gets no mention or support in the plan, while a new village hall suddenly becomes a necessity and gets plenty of space given to it	See above
Governors Church of England Primary School	11	Vision 3.1	“Demography – an ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families”. I feel that the primary school and its needs should be mentioned in this section concerning ‘Vision’. It is a vital parish facility to keep the village alive and vibrant (phrase used on page 8). We need to do all that we can to increase the numbers of young families in the village.	Agreed. Add the words in italics An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school.</i>
	12	3.3	“Provide new community facilities to address identified needs of the community”. I feel strongly that present community facilities like the village school should be supported as well as providing new ones. (See my detailed	Agreed. Add words in italics ‘Provide new community facilities <i>and support existing community facilities</i> to address identified needs of the community’.

			comments on 12.5 on page 50)	
	13	Boundary 4.4	It is unnecessary to mention the independent school and protect its needs, when no mention has been made of the village's own school.	Agreed. The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.
	14	Policy SB1	Objective 4: "Developments should meet the needs of the local community." This Neighbourhood Plan completely ignores the needs of the primary school. The large housing estate known as Site 2 offered extra parking spaces, drainage of school field and a small piece of extra land as well as houses for young families. All this has been ignored and disappeared in the draft neighbourhood plan	Any change to Objective 4 specific to the Primary School would be unrealistic to enforce through any policy. Any such policy would have to apply to all planning applications and for most, it would be almost impossible for them to demonstrate that they have considered the needs of the Primary School and have sought to protect them.
	15	Housing 5.5	This does not reflect village views adequately. NO VOTE was allowed or taken on which of the two larger sites of houses was preferred. Assumptions were made by the Parish Council that the village was 50% in favour of one and 50% in favour of the other	With the benefit of information from the judicial review decision made on 12 May 2014 in respect of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, it became an option to promote a Plan with a pro-growth housing policy but without a specific site allocation. Once this information became known to the Parish Council, it decided to consider whether to proceed without a site allocation and advice was sought, via a briefing note dated 15 July 2014 from Daventry District Council, who advised that parishioner opinion would have to support such a change. It was therefore resolved by the Parish Council to test opinion as to whether parishioners would prefer a site allocation of one of the major sites or would prefer slower more organic growth with no sites allocated but a more flexible approach to any sites adjacent to the settlement boundary which may come forward over the plan period. The promoter protocol was suspended pending the outcome of this. The outcome was that a significant majority of those participating in the September 2014 consultation rejected allocation of either

				of the larger site
	15	5.7	<p>“The community has clearly indicated...”  NO VOTE was taken on the large housing sites, only on the second proposition. A clever piece of political manoeuvring</p>	See above
	15	5.8	<p>“ the provision of affordable housing as part of any proposed housing development is a critical issue...”  Agreed. Affordable housing is important to increase the number of young families. Will this be possible with small housing developments.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, on 28 November 2014, central government changed the threshold at which there is a requirement to deliver affordable units from 5 to 10. A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read.</p> <p><i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>
	46	Highways 10.8 10.9	Pedestrian movement: There should be mention made of primary school children in this section. It is vital that safe routes to school are considered when new houses are being built.	Agreed, but this should apply to all residents. Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, ‘ <i>Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.</i> ’
	46	Highways 10.8 10.9	There is considerable concern about the safety of children walking from any new houses near to Smith street to the primary school. There is not pavement, a dangerous sharp corner and the entrance to the independent school to be crossed at a time when many cars are on the road.	Following the decision not to allocate either of the sites, there are currently no development proposals. This will be considered if and when there are as part of the planning process.
	47	10.10	I find it surprising that footpaths have a whole paragraph, yet the safety of children walking in the street is ignored	See 2 points above
	50	12.1 12.2	This is the only mention made of the village school in the whole plan – in a list of facilities. It is important, in order that Spratton continues to be a vibrant and functioning village, that it retains its community facilities where possible, and this should be stressed.,	Agreed, Add after ‘possible’ at end of first sentence in 12.2 ‘especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.
			Finally, I am sorry that village children, their safety needs and their school gets no mention or support in the plan, while a new village hall suddenly becomes a necessity and gets plenty of space given to it. This must be an oversight, surely?	This question is the same one as put by Mrs Jarvis above. Please refer to the responses.
D. Bennett	15 /1 6	5.5 + HS1`	No guarantee of deliverability – could easily be no development or any number of joined-up ones. Much better to have one scheme only	Noted
	22	Section 6	No mention of Broomhill and its expansion. Why not?	This has already been granted consent. Expansion of any

	/2 5			existing employment or commercial areas outside the settlement boundary is not supported by this Plan.
	22 /2 5	6.8 and 6.9	Why is Matts land singled out for mention here?	This policy is under review with Daventry District Council.
	30 to 35	S.7, LG3, 7.16	Verge 4 in Smith Street should not be protected. The land may be needed in future to generate passing place for traffic.	Protection does not rule out change, just makes it harder. Highways are opposing the policy of protecting verges, but we shall try and retain it.
	51	S.12 and CF1	Provision of new Village Hall – where does this come from? Not mentioned before and it was previously turned down as not sustainable or affordable!	<p>This aspiration was reported at a well-attended extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 5 March 2014.</p> <p>Agreed. Wording changes:</p> <p>Page 22, para 6.3 Change ‘village hall’ in last sentence to ‘community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’ and delete after the word ‘development’.</p> <p>Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from ‘new village hall’ to ‘new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’.</p> <p>Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after ‘community infrastructure’ to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i>.</p> <p>Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator</i></p>

				<i>business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.'</i>
S. Gammage			I did not read the plan. I do feel that it could have be condensed. I do not support the Plan	Noted
A. Frisby	12	3.3	Obj. 7 should surely also refer to supporting and enhancing existing facilities.	Agreed, words will be added
	13	4.4	If the Settlement Boundary is to include land for the expansion for Spratton Hall School, then it is even more important for it to provide for the development and enhancement of the village Primary School, which is a far greater asset to the village and makes a far greater contribution to village life.	The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.
	15	5.4	Ref. To the community's increasingly aging population should also refer to the primary school's essential role in addressing this need.	Agreed, add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demography, add the words in italics An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school.</i>
	15	5.7	The community only indicated that developments should not exceed 10 units AFTER the community was denied the opportunity to vote on alternative developments. This para is misleading and inaccurate	It was the community's wish, clearly expressed in the September 2014 consultation, that smaller developments should take place rather than either of the two larger schemes.
	15	5.8	This is inaccurate – proposals to provide affordable housing have been put aside and the village have been denied a vote on their preferences	Unfortunately, on 28 November 2014, central government changed the threshold at which there is a requirement to deliver affordable units from 5 to 10. A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read. <i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable</i>

				<p><i>housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li><i>• Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units. The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.</p> <p>Those who are concerned about a supply of affordable units should welcome the pro-growth policy of an undefined number of smaller developments over the 15-year Plan period.</p>
	29	7.14	The availability of allotments is an asset to the village in	See para 7.13

			general and not just those who currently maintain/use them	
	47	10.2	Why is there no ref. to the location of the primary school and the safety of the pupils? It is unbelievable that this aspect of village life is omitted completely from this section.	See above and also Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i>
	48		A direct route to Brampton Valley Way (leading to Brixworth) must be given priority. This is where serious accidents occur and the provision of a footpath was recommended by the Coroner, which should carry significant weight. This is something many villagers would like and benefit from.	It is specifically mentioned in policy HP2 which refers to the two possible routes
	50	12.1	Unless I am mistaken, this is the first mention in this document of the village's primary asset – the flourishing primary school. I cannot imagine another village which would not put this top of their list of concerns and priorities. We have no Post Office!	See above
	50	12.3	We have a village hall – it is listed above. It is not defunct like the Post Office. The use of the term “Meeting Facility” is disingenuous. There are lots of “meeting facilities” in the village. They are all appreciated, used and have their own individual identities.	Agreed. Wording changes: Page 22, para 6.3 Change ‘village hall’ in last sentence to <i>‘community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’</i> and delete after the word ‘development’. Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from ‘new village hall’ to <i>‘new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall’</i> . Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after ‘community infrastructure’ to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i> . Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall</i>

				<i>commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.'</i>
N. Boutle			As a governor of Spratton church of England Primary School I fully support the submission made by Enid Jarvis on behalf of the school	Noted
	46	10.7	The policy statement only makes reference to car parking, an increasing problem in parts of the village is the parking of lorries (including HGVs), large 'sprinter' vans and other vehicles too big to fit on off road parking spaces. The owners of these vehicles park them anywhere, often away from their own properties causing distress to other residents. The plan should make explicit reference to restrict the parking of lorries and other large vehicles on roads and verges within the village	Noted, but not enforceable.
	46	10.8	The reason why many of the pedestrian routes within the village are unsafe relates to the nature of the traffic using the roads, specifically HGVs using Brixworth Road as an east west short cut. This road is unsuitable for HGVs. Not only is it too narrow by Sauls and the church wall, there is a narrow bridge further down over the brook, a steep winding section into Brixworth and then traffic calming. The village plan should include an explicit statement	A new section will be added to Section 13 of the Plan headed 'Highways'. <i>There are a number of unsatisfactory issues relating to high volumes of traffic in the village, HGV's using the Brixworth Road as a through route, and insufficient rural bus services. The Parish Council will engage with the relevant parties, agencies or providers to seek improvement to these matters, including a specific approach to the issue of the narrow road above Sauls.'</i>

			restricting HGVs and large lorries using the village, except for delivery. Such a restriction is already in place down Teeton Lane	
			I would be happy to support the plan subject to substantial modification particularly in regard to the primary school (as per the governors' response)	<p>Changed or added words agreed with the Primary School Para 2.13 'young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.' to <i>'children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.'</i></p> <p>Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the words in italics An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school..</i></p> <p>Change objective 7 throughout the document to <i>'Provide new community facilities and support existing community facilities to address identified needs of the community'</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after 'where possible' add <i>'especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.'</i></p>
Colin Hayter (owns Nursery in The Walk)	11	3.2	We support the vision for Spratton, in particular the need to adapt and change, to provide housing and sustain local enterprise. We believe that this can be done whilst respecting the historic village and its landscape setting.	Noted

	13	4.3	The Draft Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) recognises that the old Local Plan ‘existing confines’ policy was a straightjacket to change that is no longer relevant to present day issues, nor does it conform with the National Planning Policy Framework. We support the more flexible approach proposed in this section of the DNP	Noted
	13	4.4	We welcome the DNP recognition that development can be acceptable adjacent to the built up area of the village. However, we are concerned that the introduction of a ‘settlement boundary’ drawn tightly around the village may be used to apply the old straightjacket policy by the back door. Other sections of the DNP rightly recognise that development of certain spaces within the built up area would be less desirable than development immediately adjacent	The spatial approach is still positive about growth, just as it would be if the settlement boundary were expanded. This provides a clearer framework to ensure that proposals which come forward are appropriate for a small village such as Spratton. It is accepted that the last sentence of para 5.3 needs to be changed as this suggests that only rural affordable housing may be built adjacent to the boundary
	13	4.5	We believe that greater clarity and consistency with Policy SB1 and paras 4.1 and 4.3 would be given by amending the opening sentence to read: <i>“Away from the village settlement boundary and property or land immediately adjacent, in the open countryside...”</i>	Agreed
	14	Policy SB1	We support the principle that development should be focussed within or immediately adjacent to the village settlement boundary. We suggest that the second sentence would be strengthened by substituting <i>“within or immediately adjacent to”</i> in place of <i>“separate from”</i> . [It is presumed that this refers to the first sentence of the second paragraph]	This point was also raised by Daventry District Council and the wording of SB1 will be changed to ‘Development outside the village boundary is classified as being in Open Countryside and development will only be acceptable where it is adjacent to the village boundary or it is a use which is sustainable development which is appropriate in the countryside.’
	15	5.3	The last sentence of this paragraph is at odds with Policy SB1, paras. 3.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 5.8. we believe that the last sentence should correctly read, <i>“The Settlement Boundary, as defined in Policy SB1, allows for development within and immediately adjacent to the Village Settlement</i>	Agreed.

			<i>Boundary</i> '.	
	15	5.7	We support the DNP in its recognition that small scale development immediately adjacent to the village settlement boundary can address present day needs and help to deliver the Vision of the DNP	Noted
	16	Policy HS1	We support this Policy. We note the approach decided upon is to enable sites to come forward during the plan period rather than relying upon a 'straw poll' at one point in time	Noted
	22	Policy CM1	We support this policy but consider that it would be stronger in purpose if its scope included property or land immediately adjacent to the village settlement boundary, subject to the historic village and landscape setting considerations set out earlier in the DNP	Agreed, particularly as the reality is that such development needs to be cross-funded by higher value development, i.e. housing, so if we don't allow incubator space adjacent to the settlement boundary, so we may be restricting its potential as part of a mixed use development.
	38	Policy LD1	We support this policy and its purpose	Noted
	40	Policy LD3	We support this policy subject to the deletion of the words " <i>as directed by Policy HS1</i> ". Amended in this way the policy would be robust in consideration of all development, not just housing	Agreed. As worded, Policy SB1 allows for all 'development' adjacent to the settlement boundary and, for the reasons explained above, this is necessary. So therefore it is inconsistent to refer to just HS1 here.
Norma & Allan Simons	1	Map	I see that there is no protected view from the Primary School to Brixworth so building here would not conflict with the VDS views	Noted.
	10	2.20	The PC opposed a planning application of a perfectly suitable site off the Brixworth Road, a development with affordable housing. This document contradicts many of the decisions that the PC have recently made.	Daventry District Council did not think that it was perfectly suitable. Cannot comment on second point without more specific detail.
	10	2.22	Where is the deprivation and how will you address it?	The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village (and any deprivation) than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable

				<p>units becoming available in the 2020s.</p> <p>Those who are concerned about a supply of affordable units should welcome the pro-growth policy of an undefined number of smaller developments over the 15-year Plan period.</p> <p>Local policy is determined by the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, adopted December 2014, with an affordable requirement of 40% of total units for developments.</p>
	11	3.1 Demography	In recent months the PC have opposed several planning applications for the village; this does not help the situation	It is the role of the Parish Council to oppose applications which are contrary to planning policies.
	13	4.3	Another contradiction as the draft states that there should be a boundary but as this, in some cases, can be ignored, it means nothing	It is clear that development may take place adjacent to the boundary subject to the other policies of the plan and the planning policies of Daventry District Council.
	13	4.4	DDC seems to agree to all Spratton Hall School's plans so I don't see why the Parish Council should give any encouragement. We should be looking at the needs that are sadly lacking in this draft	The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.
	15	5.3	Does this mean that affordable/social housing is the only housing to be built on rural exception sites?	No, the government recently changed this to allow sufficient market housing to make the scheme viable.
	15	5.7	This does not restrict the number of developments so how do you propose to provide the affordable housing said to be needed	See above
	16	5.12 Policy HS1 and 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet	How do you propose to do this?	This is a matter for Daventry District Council
	23	6.8	Also there are many ugly containers on Matts land, they certainly do not enhance the landscape and conflict with the view on the Page 1 map. Perhaps Mr Matts could be encouraged to plant trees to hide the eyesore	The Parish Council has made a request to Matts

	26	7.2	The wood on Roly Banks should be included. It is on private land as is Jubilee Wood. The trees on Roly Banks are nicely established.	There is a specific arrangement with the landowner re Jubilee Wood, we are not aware that such arrangement (for access and enjoyment) exists for Rolybanks.
	30	7.16 (4)	Part of this has recently been chopped down by residents, was this appropriate and how will you stop it happening again?	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue, but the Parish Council is trying to regularise this.
	40	8.16	Councillor Heaton obviously did not adhere to this in his recommendation for site 1 document, he did not feel that the light pollution on the high ground a problem	See Policy LD4 on page 40.
	41	8.18	Another reason why the wood on Roly Banks should be protected	There is a specific arrangement with the landowner re Jubilee Wood, we are not aware that such arrangement (for access and enjoyment) exists for Rolybanks.
	45	Traffic	Parishioners have stated that the traffic to Spratton Hall School is a major problem; at least Site 2 (opposed by the PC) would have taken some of the traffic away from the Primary school, at least doing something to alleviate the problem.	The Hall School were not prepared to support the link across Site 2. A new section will be added to Section 13 of the Plan headed 'Highways'. <i>There are a number of unsatisfactory issues relating to high volumes of traffic in the village, HGV's using the Brixworth Road as a through route, and insufficient rural bus services. The Parish Council will engage with the relevant parties, agencies or providers to seek improvement to these matters, including a specific approach to the issue of the narrow road above Sauls.'</i>
	45	Traffic	A policy is needed to prevent any development that will cause more traffic in that area	The school have advised us that they are within the limit of 402 pupils set in the 1999 planning consent, DA/99/0770., and this will be added in the Plan. We have been given to understand that the current number is nearer 400 but the Parish Council will seek confirmation
	47	10.10	At the beginning of the NP project a route to the Brampton Valley Way was offered by a landowner if building was permitted on his land nearby. Does this mean that traffic would gain access to the sire from Yew Tree Lane (a council maintained road) as access to The Walk (a Heritage	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue and cannot be commented upon in the absence of a planning application.

			rope walk site) from the village is highly dangerous, crossing the Holdenby Road	
	47	10.10	A point missed by the Project manager who was recommending Site 1 which would take away our easy access to the countryside; a footpath used by more parishioners than any other footpath in the village	Recommendation was withdrawn. No site being allocated.
	50	12.1	Post Office. One wonders if the document was proof read at all.	This error was pointed out in the recent Parish Newsletter
			Is this questionnaire a ‘seen to be doing’ exercise? It should have been updated before the NP process. It is unfair to expect much of a response from parishioners	No. It is the process by which the Plan gets refined to accord with a majority of parishioners wishes.
			Hairdresser and Beauty Salon have been excluded from the facilities	Thank you, they will be included
		Village Primary School	There is so little mention of our Primary school in the document. At the very beginning of the NP, boosting the numbers of children using the primary school was one of the priorities. This has since been forgotten.	<p>Changed or added words agreed with the Primary School Para 2.13 ‘young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.’ to  <i>‘children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.’</i></p> <p>Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the words in italics  <i>An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, affecting community facilities such as the primary school..</i></p> <p>Change objective 7 throughout the document to  <i>‘Provide new community facilities and support existing community facilities to address identified needs of the community’</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add  <i>‘Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and</i></p>

				<p><i>pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.’</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after ‘where possible’ add <i>‘especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.’</i></p>
	50	12.3	It was decided not long ago that we did not need a village hall. What’s changed?	<p>This aspiration was reported at a well-attended extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 5 March 2014</p> <p>Agreed. Wording changes:</p> <p>Page 22, para 6.3 Change ‘village hall’ in last sentence to ‘<i>community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i>’ and delete after the word ‘development’.</p> <p>Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from ‘new village hall’ to ‘<i>new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i>’.</p> <p>Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after ‘community infrastructure’ to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i>.</p> <p>Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this</i></p>

				<i>having been under discussion right back to 1950.'</i>
	52	13.5	How does the Parish Council receive contributions from a development?	At the moment it does not. Once adopted, it may receive contributions through the mechanism of the Community Infrastructure Levy administered by Daventry District Council
R Fowkes			<p>You state 'In seeking to establish an appropriate scale of growth, the community has clearly indicated that developments should not exceed 10 units.'</p> <p>This is not true, even on the evidence of those who responded to your questionnaire. Of the 289 net ballots, only 148 'would not support...significantly more than 10 homes'. This is in no way a strong majority. On top of this the fact that nearly 705 of the villagers were not motivated to respond to your questionnaire indicated, by definition, that they had no issue about a development of whatever size; be it 10 houses or 35 houses. So, in fact the community has 'clearly indicated' that it will support a development of 35 houses.</p> <p>Interestingly, in the same section, it then goes on to say that 'It will also ensure that developments will be able to address the identified affordable housing needs of the parish'. My question is How? Because you are now trying to exclude the very kind of development which was presented as the one and only way of ensuring affordable housing. I think, therefore, that we as villagers and indeed any potential interested developers, have been seriously misled here. As such Section 5 as it stands cannot be considered as valid in the context of the neighbourhood Planning Procedure.</p>	<p>The decision not to allocate a site of 35 houses was made by a majority of parishioners taking part in the September consultation, with everyone having an opportunity to have their say. We cannot agree with your interpretation of how the silent majority's views can be interpreted, this does not happen in any democratic process in this country.</p> <p>Unfortunately, on 28 November 2014, central government changed the threshold at which there is a requirement to deliver affordable units from 5 to 10. A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read.</p> <p><i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no</i></p>

				<p><i>on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li><i>• Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units. The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s. Those who are concerned about a supply of affordable units should welcome the pro-growth policy of an undefined number of smaller developments over the 15-year Plan period.</p>
S and M Matthews	1	Views	Protected views. This shows the only outlook not protected as being the area below the village school where planning was recently refused	These views are those adopted by the Village Design Statement
	11	3.1	The wish to retain high quality landscape and the views. Create highway and Pedestrian safety. The only place not protected that meets these requirements is the site below the school. It already has a viable footpath. The road could be prioritised to make it safe. The sewers would easily be provided without great upheaval.	Noted, but the decision not to allocate a site of 35 houses was made by a majority of parishioners taking part in the September consultation
	13	1.3	This seems to allow building of new houses outside the boundary for up to ten houses. Why have several building sites when one will do? How do we get the much needed	The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the

			affordable houses if only a few houses are built on each site?	village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.
	13	4.4	Spratton Hall future needs. Spratton Hall is next to land available for building on the Brixworth Road. This area has already been spoiled by building at the school. Further building in this area would keep all new development in one place. It would not spoil any views. If it is acceptable for Spratton Hall to build in this area, why not for new housing? It would not encroach onto the open countryside. Flood light of Spratton Hall School sports ground already cause light pollution so again why not keep it all together.	See reply 2 above. Daventry District Council refused the application on this site because, inter alia, it was in open countryside
	19	5.29	States new houses to be in keeping with surrounding houses. Why build stone faced small houses in High street? The surrounding houses are brick or pebbledash, the pressing need in Spratton is for small affordable housing not expensive ones.	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue, as this development relates to a prior planning consent
	26		Roly Banks is a much loved green area of the village why isn't it included when Jubilee Wood also on private ground is included	There is a specific arrangement with the landowner re Jubilee Wood, we are not aware that such arrangement (for access and enjoyment) exists for Roly Banks.
	31		Photographs of verges 1 and 2 wrong way round	Thank you. Will be changed
	37		Figure 8 again refers to the site below the primary school as not being a protected site.	Correct. The views are the same as on the Proposals Map
	41	8.18	Points out that there are few woodland areas in Spratton; again we ask why isn't Roly Banks protected? It is an area greatly enjoyed by the youngsters in the village on their way to the recreation ground	See above
	46 48	HP1 Objective 8	Objective 6 stresses the importance of addressing traffic, parking and pedestrian issues in the village	Correct.
	47	10.1	Proposed footpath to Brampton Valley Way. This is offered on the condition that the farmer is allowed to build	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue and cannot be commented upon in the absence of a planning application.

		<p>one house at the end of The Walk and to remove an existing footpath from the Walk into the field. Is it still one house? Would access be from The Walk, which is an unmade road with main services under it, and no footpath? Or yew Tree Lane which has a council maintained Road and a footpath? Agricultural traffic to the fields drive along The Walk to reach the fields which doesn't help the surface of The Walk. Will that stay the same or will farm traffic use Yew tree Lane in future? Whichever road is to be used the access to church Road and Holdenby Road is not good. The access from Yew tree Lane to Brixworth Road is not good. Building has been refused before on this site for these reasons.</p>	
	50	<p>It is disappointing that there has been no mention of the primary school until this section.</p> <p>On previous consultations with the village it has been shown that the school is an important part of the village. It is a thriving school, well supported by the villagers both young and old. New housing must include affordable housing to encourage new families to the village. This will keep a heart to village life. Care must be taken so that new housing will have safe footpaths to the school.</p>	<p>Changed or added words agreed with the Primary School Para 2.13 'young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.' to  <i>'children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.'</i></p> <p>Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the words in italics  An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school..</i></p> <p>Change objective 7 throughout the document to  <i>'Provide new community facilities and support existing community facilities to address identified needs of the community'</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add  <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and</i></p>

				<p><i>pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.’</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after ‘where possible’ add  <i>‘especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.’</i></p> <p>The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.</p>
			The mention of the Post Office, which has been closed for many years makes us wonder if the person compiling this plan knows anything about the village and its needs.	This error was pointed out in the recent Parish Newsletter
			We know a lot of people who have had difficulty in accessing this plan and many, including ourselves, who have found it confusing.	Other than when the Brixworth Library copy went missing (but was quickly replaced) no other difficulties have been reported to the Parish Council. There were 2 copies in the Kings Head and 2 in Cafe Doris.
			The fact that this plan has been proof read and the mistake the post office and the photographs of the verges being with the wrong captions not having been picked up makes us questions the rest of the document. How much more of the document isn’t correct and how much interested (Sic) in the project did the people concerned have? The Plan seems very misleading and contradictory we cannot agree it.	This is the purpose of consultation.
A. Leeson	14	SB1	Endorses objectives 1, 2, 3.	
	17	HS1	Endorses objectives 1, 4, 8	
	20	HS2	No houses or any buildings on Roly Banks and outside the agreed area	Noted
	30	LG2	Provision of adequate allotments	It has not been suggested to us that there is any new land

				requirement for these, but we understand that the owner has significant additional land.
	38	LD1	Robust protection of landscape and views: future generations will not thank you if these are destroyed	Noted. The Plan has this.
	40	LD3	As above. No plans to be bulldozed through	Noted
	41	LD4	Spratton Hall school already have their flood lights on well after school time	Noted
	48	HP2	New footpaths into farmland restrict the types of animals that can graze, putting extra cost on farmers. A new footpath in the wide verge between Spratton and Brixworth would be very beneficial.	Agreed. The Parish Council has been seeking this for many years, but funding is not available.
			I would like to complain about the way that the consultation document was produced. It was far too long, and with the restricted access, either via a computer or at the Library, not everybody is computer literate, or the time to get to grips with what is being decided, and if the wrong decisions are made, could be disastrous	For information and whilst there aren't many completed Plans, the longest that has been found is 98 pages (in two volumes) and the shortest 36. Ours is 52 pages + an appendix which is there for supplemental information. Plan-making requires a format to be followed which, unfortunately, results in the length of such documents. Two copies were also deposited in the Kings Head, and two in Cafe Doris, giving ample opportunity for examination.
S.May			No info in Plan re Primary school future	Changed or added words agreed with the Primary School Para 2.13 'young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.' to <i>'children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.'</i> Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the words in italics An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school..</i> Change objective 7 throughout the document to <i>'Provide new community facilities and support existing</i>

				<p><i>community facilities to address identified needs of the community'</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add  <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after 'where possible' add  <i>'especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.'</i></p>
C. Bull			Primary school not mentioned at all. Having worked at the school there needs to be a safe access	See above
N. Kenway			How can we have a plan which doesn't include the future of the school	See above
M. Morris			No proposal for Primary school or the traffic alleviation which is the village's future	See above. One of the relief roads was undeliverable, the other unsupported.
V. Stewart			No thought for village children or the school. We need to keep the Rec and Roly Banks to cemetery	See above. The Plan makes no site allocation.
A Stewart			No thought for village children or the school. We need to keep the Rec and Roly Banks to cemetery. Keep the village safe from traffic	See above, and There is a specific arrangement with the landowner re Jubilee Wood, we are not aware that such arrangement (for access and enjoyment) exists for Rolybanks.
K Bull			Has not taken into account the community wishes	There have been four consultations and the Plan is based on the responses from these. This was the purpose of this consultation
C Morris			(Sic) (The Proposed development on Brixworth Rd) the village as at its capacity for schools and road traffic	Whilst the roads are at capacity, the Primary School is not.
W Denny			My first concern is that not being able to view and divulge the information put forward by the draft plan as I do not	The plan was available online and in the Kings Head, open in the evenings.

			have time during my working day to get to the church to read the document. I do not drive so the library in Brixworth is not an option	
A Taylor			I fail to see how views expressed within consultation have been fairly incorporated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Most of the sections within plan have never been voted on or put to consultation	This was the purpose of this consultation
Jodi Gaywood			I feel that further consultation is required, the village has not agreed this plan.	This was the purpose of this consultation.
M Lawrence			I don't believe the plan in any way reflects the feelings of myself and many other villagers	This was the purpose of this consultation
M Gaywood			I feel further consultation with the village is required as the majority of sections within the document have never been consulted with the parishioners.	This was the purpose of this consultation
			We do not have a post office in Spratton. This shows inaccuracy and lack of care within the current draft	This mistake was pointed out in the recent Newsletter
S Newham			I feel proper consultation with the village has not been done therefore I reject the whole Plan	There have been four consultations and the Plan is based on the responses from these. This was the purpose of this consultation..
M McPhee			Narrow minded view of the future of my village! And the future of the place in which we live. The youth of Spratton should be catered for not just the rich outsiders.	The youth are being addressed by a new policy, see Page 51, policy CF1.
G Gaywood			Firstly I would like to point out that there are two different draft plans available for viewing on your website, draft plan and presubmission draft plan. The consultation response form leads parishioners towards the draft plan as it does not mention 'presubmission' at all. Therefore I suspect that it is highly likely that parishioners have been consulting on the wrong document. Especially as I still do not know for sure which one is correct. After taking advice on this matter, I can confidently state that due to this	The website records the stages in the process with the latest version at the 'top' of the page in line with normal convention.

			discrepancy, if proper practice is followed this consultation has to be declared void.	
			At the chance that proper practice is not followed, I would like to give my account. It is my opinion that the Parish Council are not currently in a position to produce a draft plan let alone be consulting on it. This opinion is endorsed when considering that the drafts contents do not reflect the views of parishioners established across this process. Instead, it reflects the results of one leading questionnaire.	The have been many changes in statute and case law, and any Plan has to adapt to these as it proceeds.
			Through consultation we have ascertained that 86.52% of the 141 parishioners that answered the question deemed the Primary School very important to our community. Since this consultation there's been no mandate to remove or not consider the Primary School within the Neighbourhood Plan. Further to that, on the Neighbourhood Plan seminar posted on the Parish Council website you state how it is rewarding to think about the school. It is my opinion that this draft has intentionally avoided highlighting the Primary School due to its direct connection with our site and the inevitability that to highlight the school, and how best to secure its longevity and performance, would in turn highlight the merits of our site.	<p>Changed or added words agreed with the Primary School Para 2.13 'young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.' to <i>'children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.'</i></p> <p>Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the words in italics An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school..</i></p> <p>Change objective 7 throughout the document to <i>'Provide new community facilities and support existing community facilities to address identified needs of the community'</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after 'where possible' add</p>

				<i>'especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.'</i>
			In my opinion, it would be particularly harmful to document the importance us parishioners put on delivering a safe route to school for our children as this would effect a future and perhaps immanent application for houses on Mr. Kelly's land.	There is no site allocation in the Plan. Any planning applications are considered on their merit
			It is also my opinion that the smaller "unidentified sites" are not so unidentified. [Next sentence redacted on legal advice]	Noted.
			This plan is fundamentally flawed in one of its primary goals from the outset, declared by Cllr Frenchman, to protect the village. It has left us open to the prospect of numerous planning applications over a period of time for ten houses market houses, creating a large site that does not provide the community benefits we have consulted upon. As a Parish Council it is your role to ensure parishioners are making informed responses to consultations. Why are you not informing them of the potential repercussions of this plan?	Each planning application would have to meet the other policies of the Plan and Daventry District Council's policies, and the land would have to be contiguous with the settlement boundary. As to the last sentence, this is the purpose of this consultation.
			As you will be aware, the emerging Core Strategy requires rural sites of 5+ dwellings to provide affordable housing. However, on 28 <sup>th</sup> November 2014 the government released new guidance which states that <i>"affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development"</i> on sites of 10 units or less, which have a combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm. See link: <a href="http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/revisions/23b/012/">http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/revisions/23b/012/</a>	A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read. <i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst</i>

		<p>This guidance makes the Core Strategy affordable housing policy out of date, and in applying the new guidance the Parish Council will not be able to secure affordable housing through smaller scale housing of less than 10 dwellings as proposed within the draft plan. This means that, based on the definition of Sustainable Development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (specifically the definition of the ‘social role’ at paragraph 7), the Plan would fail to “contribute to the achievement of sustainable development” (Schedule 4B, Paragraph 8(2)(d) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).</p> <p>In light of this information, and the importance placed on transparency along with making decisions based on the best available information, it would only be appropriate to hold further consultation. Consultation to seek the opinions of parishioners based on this new information. Do they still want smaller, organic growth in light that it is highly unlikely to bring about the affordable housing aspect we have identified a need for?</p>	<p><i>Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>
<p>D Cooke G Rodgers P Greenwood G Gaywood M Gaywood S Newham S Alfred J Gaywood R Abbott S Hussey A Wykes N Kenway</p>		<p>Please take this as notice that I am not satisfied with the Pre submission Draft of Spratton’s neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029 (October 2014) as currently shown on Spratton Parish council’s website.</p> <p>I consider that there are many problems with the latest document under consultation. As a examples, one major and critical omission from the draft is that a plan of this type should definitely include or even prioritise our village’s primary school. This should be one of the most important considerations in the text.</p> <p>However, the only mention of the Primary School in the current document is found under section 12.1 Community facilities which is a simple list of the existing amenities in</p>	<p>A Neighbourhood Plan is a land-use plan, the primary function of which is to direct built development. Throughout the process of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, the importance of the school has been emphasised in parishioner responses. However, there are no specific planning policies (in the blue boxes) that directly relate to the school because we have not been made aware of any specific development requirements that the school has through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>Any policies for the future of the school would normally be found in a Parish Plan, a document very recently produced (2010) and designed to ‘identify the community’s needs and aspirations’. The primary school leads, as it should, the</p>

<p>A Taylor Jodi Gaywood M Lawrence R Bucknole D Mould T Mould G Jones A Cattell J Douglas</p>			<p>the village at April 2014. Other than that , there is total lack of information, future plans or support for our village school within the latest draft.</p> <p>On that basis, I expect the Parish Council to suspend the present plan until such time that further consultation with the parishioners has taken place. This would more accurately assess the points that the residents of Spratton would prefer to see within their plan, than the process to date has.</p> <p>I avidly support the growing feeling that before drafting another replacement plan, the Parish Council should send out their own list of suggested headers for possible inclusion in the new plan for parishioners to vote on. This should include a section for parishioners to put forward their own headers for possible inclusion.</p> <p>Only then can the Parish Council be in a position to judge what issues are important to the village. Subsequently, each of the voted in headers should be individually consulted on with the village. This will reveal the public’s true and democratic opinion for inclusion in the final draft. This is the only way that a robust neighbourhood Plan, reflecting the wishes of the majority of the parishioners, can be produced by the Parish Council for the future of our community.</p>	<p>list of village facilities but there is no specific need or aspiration stated in this section. Of course, the Neighbourhood Plan should, if it were possible, ensure that the school is supported and is maintained as a vibrant village school, but this can only be done within the context of a land-use plan. It is agreed that there were potential benefits for the school (as distinct from the village in terms of reduction of teacher parking in School Road) but parishioners did not support either of the large schemes after taking these benefits into account. A Neighbourhood Plan can only proceed with the support of a majority of the people who engage with the process.</p>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>3.1</p>	<p>Heritage We welcome the inclusion of this Objective. However, the wording should be modified to broaden the scope of the objective and help deliver benefits for Spratton Parish. ‘Protect and enhance the landscape and heritage of Spratton’</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
	<p>16</p>	<p>HS1</p>	<p>The requirement to respect and enhance the historic environment should be strengthened by referring to protect</p>	<p>It already does so in the fifth bullet point.</p>

			and enhance the historic environment. We support the requirement to maintain Spratton village's strong and established sense of place.	
	38	LD1	<p>We note the Map shown in Figure 8.1 showing protected views into and out of Spratton Village. Many of the views, both into and out of the village, are views towards designated and non-designated heritage assets. English Heritage guidance is available on both the setting of heritage assets and views.</p> <p>'The setting of heritage assets'</p> <p>This document sets out guidance on managing change within the settings of heritage assets, including archaeological remains and historic buildings, sites, areas, and landscapes</p> <p><a href="https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/advice-by-topic/setting-and-views/">https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/advice-by-topic/setting-and-views/</a></p> <p>'Seeing the history in the view'</p> <p>This document presents a method for understanding and assessing heritage significance within views. The method can be applied to any view that is significant in terms of its heritage values as in the case of the views identified in Figure 8.1.</p> <p><a href="https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/advice-by-topic/setting-and-views/seeing-the-history-in-the-view/">https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/advice-by-topic/setting-and-views/seeing-the-history-in-the-view/</a></p>	Noted
	43	HD1	<p>Paragraph 9.1 should be broadened to encompass the wider heritage of Spratton Parish and reworded as follows.</p> <p>'Spratton has a rich historic environment, with a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets within the parish boundaries. The village has a clear architectural heritage within the centre and its Heritage Trail includes a</p>	Agreed

			number of listed buildings.’	
	43	9.3	Paragraph 9.3 should be reworded as follows: ‘...new development observes and includes in its design the use of materials that are in keeping with the character of the village.’ This will more closely align the supporting text with Policy HD1 which requires new extensions to be built using matching style and materials used in the main building; in the more modern buildings in the village, this will not always be local materials.	Agreed
		Appendix 1	Heritage There are nine designated heritage assets in the village; all listed buildings, including the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew. It would be helpful if this section listed these designated heritage assets, mapped them and provided photographs. The reference to the numerous other buildings of historic and local interest and quality is welcomed. Paragraph 15 would benefit from an introductory sentence explaining that Spratton has a rich historic environment, with both designated and non-designated heritage assets	Agreed, to be re-organised.
G Rodgers	15	5.7	We were in favour of smaller developments of up to 10 dwellings; however, an upper limit must be set for the number of dwellings must be established before we can approve any draft plan. And the development on the old leather factory should be included in the proposals	The plan needs to provide flexibility for sustainable growth. With the option of allocating a site no longer justifiable, this approach provides flexibility. In reality it is not considered likely that there will be lots of sites coming forward because many of the areas around the village have specific issues with delivering a housing scheme. The old leather factory development is based on an historic planning consent, which cannot be included in this Plan.
	26	Green spaces	The Roly Banks is an important recreational area for the community and a main route to the cemetery. I think that the Roly Banks should be included in the other listed	There is a specific arrangement with the landowner re Jubilee Wood, we are not aware that such arrangement (for access and enjoyment) exists for Roly Banks.

			protected spaces. (Area A, B and C)	
	37		<p>The map shown in Figure 8.1 differs from that issued by Daventry District Council on 15 May 2013. Both maps indicate the important walls in the village. However, in the version submitted with the draft Plan three walls have been removed from this category</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lower end of Smith Street abutting the listed building Home Farm.</li> <li>2. A section of wall to the right hand side of the entrance to Spratton Hall School (as you enter the School from Manor Road/Smith Street).</li> <li>3. And finally a large stretch of wall on church Road.</li> </ol> <p>I would be interested in a response to why these stretches of important wall have been changed in the Draft Plan</p>	<p>The map, Figure 8.1 is used solely for the matter of views and has no relevance to the over-arching policy for walls, dealt with in section 9, with a robust policy stating <i>‘Existing locally distinctive old cob, stone and brick boundary walls and buildings, thatched and slate roofs should be protected and conserved.’</i></p> <p>The map in figure 8.1 will be replaced by the version intended, with no walls marked.</p>
	50	12.1	Post Office	Already noted elsewhere and reported in the recent Parish newsletter.
P. Letten			No confidence in plan due to underhand methods obviously going on by various parties	Understood that this refers to the protection of walls matter, see above.
E Pryor	7	2.10 2.11	Useful to know how many primary and pre-school children age group 30-44 has fallen – more mix of housing could be reason. My two sons, aged 33 and 36, have left Spratton, one for more affordable housing and the other because of the need for social housing. They are both in different villages, they would have preferred Spratton, they were born here.	Unfortunately, on 28 November 2014, central government changed the threshold at which there is a requirement to deliver affordable units from 5 to 10. A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read. <i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst</i>

				<p><i>Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units. The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.</p>
	11	3.1 3.3	No mention of primary school	<p>Agreed, many changes have been agreed with the school as follows</p> <p>Para 2.13 ‘young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.’ to  ‘<i>children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.</i>’</p> <p>Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the</p>

				<p>words in italics</p> <p>An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school.</i></p> <p>Change objective 7 throughout the document to <i>'Provide new community facilities and support existing community facilities to address identified needs of the community'</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after 'where possible' add <i>'especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.'</i></p>
	15	5.5 5.7	Spratton Hall School given opportunities to develop. No mention of opportunities for Primary School which had been addressed in recent site 2 proposal. Site 2 would have given these parking spaces to primary school	<p>The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.</p> <p>A majority of those taking part in the September 2014 consultation rejected allocation of a major site.</p>
			Latest infill on Manor Road looks good but is well above average wage affordability	Noted
	19	5.27 10.5	No mention of school safety issues. No mention of on-going Spratton Hall School traffic	Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, 'Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i>

				A new section will be added to Section 13 of the Plan headed 'Highways'. <i>There are a number of unsatisfactory issues relating to high volumes of traffic in the village, HGV's using the Brixworth Road as a through route, and insufficient rural bus services. The Parish Council will engage with the relevant parties, agencies or providers to seek improvement to these matters, including a specific approach to the issue of the narrow road above Sauls.'</i>
	26	7.3	Pocket Park. Many residents ignore this. If previous site agreed it would be more inclusive within the village boundary	Noted
	50	12.3 12.4	'the current meeting facility' is the village hall – need to look back at recent changes from previous W.I. hall and generous donation to enable this	<p>Wording changes:</p> <p>Page 22, para 6.3 Change 'village hall' in last sentence to '<i>community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i>' and delete after the word 'development'.</p> <p>Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from 'new village hall' to '<i>new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i>'.</p> <p>Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after 'community infrastructure' to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i>.</p> <p>Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator</i></p>

				<i>business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.</i>
	50	12.4	Additional leisure facilities and parking would be very welcome	Noted and see above
			I appreciate the Plan would have been expensive to distribute to each household but also know that many residents have not looked at it because it is available mainly online. This has not been a problem for me but it has been for other residents without computers or those who prefer a paper copy	Distribution cost of 500 copies would have been around £4000. Consultation for this Plan was carried out in accordance with normal procedure.
G Bennett			Thought that the plan was thorough – slightly inaccurate e.g. implying that parking on the verge is common in School Road and it isn't. If you look carefully there is only one car on the grass but yes parking is very important. Just hope any housing it called affordable is not like the 'affordable' housing in Creaton which several years ago started at £250,000. I really don't know – conflicting advice – need an overall view not a biased one.	Noted, but one car can wreck a verge as evidenced by a photograph taken on 18 December 2014.
Val Coleby for S Holt	14	SB1	We agree with Policy SB1 that development should be within the settlement boundary or adjoining it.	Noted
	16	HS1	We agree that individual developments should include up to 10 dwellings either within or adjoining the village. We suggest that the second bullet point should be amended to read: <i>"It shall provide a mix of unit sizes taking in to account the site circumstances and context"</i> This amendment will provide a mix of unit sizes on site but allows a scheme to be designed in relation to site circumstances and surrounding properties. Housing needs change overtime and may be very different when the site is assessed and when it is eventually built. It may then be	The whole purpose of the policy reflecting housing needs is that the sites should deliver for the needs of the community. Site circumstances and context will need to be taken into account in any event as part of a planning application so the suggested wording does not add anything, whilst taking away the key purpose of this part of the policy in respect of housing needs. As you will be aware, on 28 November 2014, central government changed the threshold at which there is a requirement to deliver affordable units from 5 to 10. A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace

			<p>responding to a set of housing needs that no longer exist. As regards affordable housing requirements and the thresholds applied the policy should make reference to National Guidance issued through the National Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	<p>wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read.</p> <p><i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>
	20	HS2	<p>With regard to the first bullet point of this Policy which refers to the uniformity of the street scene, in our view there are areas within the village that do not have a uniformity and are characterised by the individuality of</p>	<p>Agreed. The words <i>‘It should reinforce the uniformity of the street by reflecting the scale, mass, height and form of its neighbours’</i> to be replaced by <i>‘Where appropriate, it should reflect the scale, mass, height and form of its</i></p>

			properties that make up the street view. I suggest the words <i>'reinforce the uniformity of the street by'</i> should be deleted.	neighbours.'
	48	HP2	We support the Parish Council's objectives to improve the footpath links to the countryside.	Noted
County Highways	35	LG3	Many of the green spaces included in this policy refer to verges that may be highway land, therefore they cannot be protect green areas as they may be needed to provide space for services, visibility splays or access. Hence policy LG3 in its present format should be removed from the plan.	There is a difference between developing these parcels of land and their use as described in the representation. The policy wording will be amended to reflect the fact that the only acceptable change to these spaces should be for enabling development, e.g. service provision, visibility splays or access.
	46	HP1	The general emphasis of this policy aligns with Northamptonshire Highways concerns about developments providing sufficient parking, however the policy is too specific with regards to making all the car parking spaces off- road. Northamptonshire Highways would rather that the policy was widened to these spaces being provided as a mix of off- road and on highway parking, so giving more flexibility to the parking provision within the local community.	We don't agree that this is appropriate in an historic rural village with a medieval street pattern.
	48	HP2	Northamptonshire Highways is supportive of a policy that promotes further opportunities for walking. However, the policy as written is misleading and limited due to its specific nature. The policy title could be change to "improved provision for walking", and the policy then be directed at creating further walking links/ connecting missing links.	Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, Add to page 46, para 10.8 and to policy HP2, <i>'Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.'</i> Policy HP2 will be re-titled as suggested.
			<u>General Comments</u> Other Neighbourhood Plans that I have been involved with in the county, are aligned with Core Strategies as Local Plans such as Daventry's are too dated for this process. If this document was further aligned with	Noted

			<p>the West Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (WNCSS) it would be a progress plan instead of the rather prescriptive document that has been produced. Aligning with the WNCSS would require the village to identify directions for growth and that process would be informative for the local community and potential developers.</p> <p>Parking is a problem in most settlement, and it may be that that village needs to give wider consideration to the issues, by perhaps considering space for a village car park or looking at how specific parking problems might be dealt with. The results of these investigations could then be used to inform the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The plan seems to be missing any reference to cycling or public transport both subjects that are usually given positive consideration in Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	
Daventry DC	3	1.6	This section requires updating to reflect the change in status of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy	Agreed
	3	1.7	This section will need to be updated when the Joint Core Strategy is adopted. This should take place before the Neighbourhood plan is submitted to Daventry District Council	Noted and will be done
	14	SB1	The policy as currently written incorrectly describes Open Countryside and is currently in conflict with policy HS24 as it describes adjacent land as not being Open Countryside, which it is. In addition it also leaves too much scope for interpretation of what is 'separate'. Furthermore there are concerns about the term 'appropriate for the countryside' and this needs to be qualified with reference to sustainable development.	Wording will be changed as suggested and referenced to the proposals map.

			<p>As presently written the concerns related to this policy have implications for the implementation of other policies, for example CM2.</p> <p>The policy should therefore be changed, suggested wording along the lines of; “Development outside the village boundary is classified as being in Open Countryside and development will only be acceptable where it is adjacent to the village boundary or it is a use which is sustainable development which is appropriate in the countryside”</p> <p>This policy should refer to the proposals map set out on page 1.</p>	
	16	HS1	<p>The 3rd bullet point needs amending to refer to the Core Strategy policy H2.</p> <p>The 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point includes reference to a local lettings policy which is not required. Therefore this part of the sentence should be deleted and the policy should commence with “the affordable..”</p>	Agreed
	20	HS2	<p>Final bullet point. The term on these streets should be deleted.</p>	Agreed
	22	CM1	<p>The policy is currently inconsistent as it refers to development within the settlement boundary however the settlement boundary allows for some development adjacent to it.</p>	Agree that this should be amended to reflect the fact that incubator space should be permissible adjacent to the settlement boundary, subject to it not encroaching overly on open countryside.
	25	CM2	<p>It would be helpful, in the supporting text, to define what ‘minor’ means.</p> <p>Concerned that this policy isn’t deliverable at present as a minor extension to an existing employment area that is outside the curtilage will be classified as Open Countryside. Suggested change to the wording of the final bullet point to “It must not be detrimental to the character of the wider open countryside or views across it”</p>	<p>Agree that clearer definition of what constitutes ‘minor’ would be helpful. Also agree with the wording as proposed.</p> <p>In terms of a form of words this should stem from the reasons for why the term minor is used in the plan, is this to strike a balance between allowing some expansion but also protecting the character of the area? If this is the case a form of words may give reference to extensions being proportionate with its function without harming the</p>

				character of the area.
26 27	Local Green Spaces	<p>Whilst the descriptions of the 4 proposed areas are helpful further detail is required for each area against the bullet points of paragraph 7.2 to demonstrate how the space meets each of the criteria.</p> <p>It will also be important to consider paragraph 78 of the NPPF that local policy for managing developments within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts and the implications of this for the Local Green Spaces within Spratton.</p>	<p>Four proposed green areas to be specified in more detail with addition of the words to each</p> <p>Area A is a few minute’s walk from the centre of the village, has been a cemetery since 1905 and is still visited by relatives, and is a small compact wildlife area of some 0.2 hectares.</p> <p>Area B is within about 100 metres from the centre of the village, and has a sign erected for the Millennium. It has seating and is a quiet place for contemplation which is extensively used. It is a very small area, originally the site of two hovels.</p> <p>Area C is a 2.4 hectare site on the edge of the village, 5 minutes walk from its centre. It is used by the local football club and has a skate park and a playground area used by the young people in the village.</p> <p>Area D is some 10 minutes walk from the centre of the village, but adjacent to a much-used footpath. It is a compact area of a similar size to Area A</p> <p>Add an extra bullet point at the end of Policy LG1 to say: “the proposal would not conflict with the openness or purpose of the Local Green Space”</p>	
39	8.14	The supporting text makes reference to the allocation of sites. No sites are allocated in the plan and therefore this wording needs to be altered.	Agreed	
40	LD3	As currently written this policy is not in accordance with policy EN1 of the Local Plan, Special Landscape Area and therefore is not at present in general conformity with this strategic policy. This particularly applies to the first 2	Agree that development within the Special Landscape Area that is adjacent to the settlement boundary should apply a set of criteria as suggested.	

			bullet points which do not allow for an assessment of the impact on the character of the Special Landscape Area. Therefore criteria needs to be included to allow for this.	
	43	HD1	<p>There are internal inconsistencies with this policy, for example new development should not be repetitive (bullet point 3) but should harmonise with neighbouring properties (bullet point 1). This should be rectified.</p> <p>In addition the policy is considered to be inconsistent with policy HS1, in particular through seeking for buildings not to be repetitive (bullet point 3) however policy HS1 refers to respecting the built environment (bullet point 5) and maintaining Spratton's strong and established sense of place (bullet point 6). Again the wording of the policy needs to be changed to reflect a consistent approach.</p>	The wording ' New developments should not be repetitive but in scale and in keeping with the village vernacular' will be deleted
Mulberry Developments	3	1.6 + 1.7	Updating of the text is required to reflect the latest position in respect of the emerging West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.	Agreed
	11	3.1	<p>The Vision and Objectives chapter of the Pre-submission Draft Plan confirms that <i>"the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to address, as far as is possible, the challenges that face the community of Spratton Parish"</i> and identifies demography (specifically the <i>"low proportions of young people, particularly young families"</i>), housing (needing to <i>"ensure that new housing addresses the needs of the community..."</i>), highway/pedestrian safety and traffic congestion (including... <i>"the limited road space created by the historic layout"</i>) and community facilities (...<i>"the need to provide facilities that are wanted by residents, in order to retain Spratton as a vibrant community"</i>) as matters to be addressed by the Plan.</p> <p>It will be set out later in these representations why the Pre-Submission Draft Plan is not considered to achieve this</p>	Noted

			vision and objectives.	
	11	Vision for Spratton	<p>The vision should specifically identify the desire to provide both new affordable and open market housing, as opposed to making reference to housing in general terms.</p> <p>A major driver for the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area was the opportunity to deliver affordable housing. This should be a fundamental element of the vision and should be set out within the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 3.3.</p>	<p>We do not agree. The vision represents the views of the community.</p> <p>This was not referred to in our application to have the neighbourhood area designated, or in DDC's reasons for accepting the designation, so what you state is incorrect.</p>
	13	4.3	<p>Mulberry support a <i>“more flexible approach to development adjacent to the built-up area of the village in order that it can properly accommodate the levels of growth likely to come forward through the updated planning policy framework provided by Daventry District Council”</i></p>	Noted
	13	4.4	<p>Specific reference is made to the private education premises, ‘Spratton Hall School’. This includes the identification of land around the existing buildings <i>“to address its future needs, provided these are to serve pupil numbers in line with those as at the end of the 2013/2014 academic year”</i>. While Mulberry have no interest in the land associated with the Hall School, it seems perverse that a Plan that covers the period through until 2029 is seeking to constrain development at Spratton Hall School to its needs at 2013/2014, as opposed to allowing flexibility to meet needs for the entirety of the Plan period.</p> <p>Furthermore, no reference is made to Spratton Primary School at this point. This is despite the Primary School being a community facility that is at the centre of the village, at the heart of village life, and is located on a relatively compact site in need of the opportunity for growth and/or reorganisation. In the context of the scope</p>	<p>The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted, and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.</p> <p>Regardless of the line of the village envelope around the primary school, were the school to wish to expand with the support of the Local Education Authority, education would be a material consideration for expanding adjacent to the existing facility, albeit such development would accord with Policy SB1 of the Plan anyway.</p>

			for development allowed for at Spratton Hall School, it is considered appropriate to allow for expansion of Spratton Primary School also.	
13	4.4	<p>The final sentence states that <i>“the housing strategy articulated in Policy HS1 ensures that developments are no larger than ten dwellings so that they do not represent significant development”</i>.</p> <p>As will be set out in respect of the housing policy HS1, this threshold is considered to be arbitrary, and actually serves to prevent the delivery of affordable housing through residential development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area as a consequence of the latest National Planning Policy Guidance issued on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014 in respect of Planning Obligations which expressly excludes developments of 10 dwellings or less from the requirement to deliver affordable housing. Therefore, the premise upon which the community supported limiting residential development to a maximum of 10 dwellings no longer applies and needs to be revisited, particularly given that the need for delivery of affordable housing was a fundamental basis for designating the Neighbourhood Area in the first place.</p>	<p>A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read.</p> <p><i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>	

	15	5.1	The paragraph notes that the Parish had 1,150 people within 498 dwellings at the time of the 2011 census, and experienced a 6% growth (28 dwellings) in the number of dwellings between the 2001 census and the 2011 census. This percentage growth represents relatively modest growth for the village over a ten year period.	Noted
	15	5.2	The word ‘settlement’ should be plural.	Agreed
	15	5.2 + 5.3	Cross reference is made to the housing requirements set out within the emerging Joint Core Strategy. Given the advanced stage of the Core Strategy, and the comparable Plan Period (the Joint Core Strategy covers the period to 2029), it is considered appropriate that the housing numbers to be accommodated in the rural areas are presented here, along with clarification about what this equates to in terms of percentage increase in the total number of dwellings in the rural areas. This will help the community to understand the broad scale of development that the rural areas are expected to accommodate, and the level of development that could be expected to be delivered at Spratton. In this respect, Policy S3 confirms that Daventry Rural Areas will be required to deliver about 2,360 dwellings during the Plan Period 2011 – 2029.	Given that this quantum of housing is expected to be delivered in so many villages, it does not help the reader to understand the role of Spratton in contributing towards delivering this target.
	15	5.3	The final sentence at Paragraph 5.3 states that “ <i>The Village Settlement Boundary, as defined in Policy SB1, allows for new development within the settlement area and for affordable housing on rural exception sites immediately adjacent to it</i> ”. In fact Policy SB1 does not restrict new development to sites within the ‘settlement area’, nor does it indicate that the only residential development outside the Settlement Boundary shall be limited to affordable housing on rural exception sites immediately adjacent to the	The additional words ‘or adjacent to’ will be added to para 5.3

			boundary (that is in fact the position set out within the Daventry Local Plan Saved Policy HS22 which the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges at Paragraph 4.3 is not sufficiently flexible). Draft Policy SB1 merely states that “ <i>development shall be focused within or adjacent to the village settlement boundary of Spratton</i> ” (Pegasus emphasis). Paragraph 5.3 therefore needs a correction to accurately reflect Policy SB1.	
	15	5.4	It is stated that “ <i>the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to plan positively for growth. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes is essential to support sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities. In Spratton this will help to ensure the ongoing viability of local services and prosperity of the Parish, particularly in light of the community’s increasingly ageing population</i> ”. This text should also make express reference to the appropriateness of delivering affordable housing as part of any large scale residential growth at the village.	This text is reasonable, but it is not appropriate or necessary to make any reference to ‘large scale’.
	15	5.5	Reference is made to the need for growth to be incremental. If it is determined that incremental growth is important to control the rate of housing delivery, this could be achieved through a number of approaches (i.e. phased delivery of one larger site, or several separate sites coming forward).	The words “‘incremental and’ will be deleted
	15	5.6	The concern regarding the affordability of dwellings at Spratton is shared by Mulberry. In terms of data evidencing demand for affordable housing within Spratton, and more generally across the District, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan identifies that the latest housing needs survey for the area that has been released was in 2012. However, there are other indicators of housing need that are also appropriate to include within the Neighbourhood	Noted

		<p>Plan to evidence the need for affordable housing. Daventry District Council's Housing Options team has confirmed that, as of November 2014, there were 886 live applications for affordable housing provision. Of these current applicants on the register there are 35 applicants who are living in Spratton and the adjoining villages (including Creaton, Hollowell, Church Brampton, Chapel Brampton, Holdenby and Brixworth). Furthermore, 56 people on the register had expressly identified Spratton as a preferred location.</p>	
15	5.7+5.8	<p>The Plan proposes to allow "<i>small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary</i>" and states that "<i>the community has clearly indicated that developments should not exceed ten units</i>". It goes on to claim that this will enable growth "<i>at a scale that is in keeping with the current size of the village and the range of services it provides to its community</i>" and that such schemes "<i>will also ensure that developments will be able to address the identified affordable housing needs of the parish</i>".</p> <p>The position adopted does not take into account the most recent expression of Government guidance regarding affordable housing. On 28th November the Government amended the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) to include new paragraphs (ID 23b-012-20141128). This new national threshold gives an exemption from affordable housing and tariff-style contributions on developments of 10 units or fewer which have a combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000 square metres. The new guidance applies to all areas except "designated rural areas" as described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, and these include National Parks and Areas of Outstanding</p>	<p>A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read.</p> <p><i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential</i></li> </ul>

		<p>National Beauty, as well as any additional rural areas designated by order of the Secretary of State. As things stand Spratton would not fall to be considered under the “designated rural areas” criteria and so a scheme of 10 dwellings would not attract any affordable housing contribution. As a consequence, the Neighbourhood Plan’s approach to housing will fail to deliver affordable housing in conjunction with open market residential developments. The second main reason given for the Parish Council’s application to designate a neighbourhood area was the lack of affordable housing stock, and indeed Paragraph 5.8 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan confirms that “<i>the provision of affordable housing as part of any proposed housing development is a critical issue and therefore developments that deliver affordable housing – either through a market-led scheme or through a rural exception site – will be viewed favourably</i>” (Pegasus emphasis). In this context, the premise on which the community voted to opt for ‘smaller’ sites (i.e. that ‘smaller’ schemes can still deliver the critically important affordable housing provision) is no longer applicable.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan would therefore fail to deliver any affordable housing for the next 15 years (unless it were to come forward through exception sites) and, in the context that one of the two main reasons for seeking designation as a neighbourhood area was affordable housing delivery, this would be in clear conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and the emphasis on meeting housing needs, supporting strategic needs, and planning positively (paragraph 16 of the NNPF).</p>	<p><i>units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be commercially viable</i></li> </ul> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units.</p>
	16	5.12	<p>Support is given for the recognition that there is a need for housing (open market as well as affordable) to be delivered</p> <p>Noted</p>

			that caters for a range of property sizes and types, as evidenced by the West Northamptonshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	
	16	HS1	<p>Draft Policy HS1 supports the grant of permission for residential development “<i>within or immediately adjacent to the village settlement boundary</i>” subject to a number of criteria. This includes the limit of the scale of development to schemes of “<i>up to 10 dwellings</i>”. There is no evidential basis for restricting development to such a threshold and there are concerns that such schemes will be incapable of creating significant new infrastructure for the village.</p> <p>The draft Policy, for the reasons outlined above in respect of paragraphs 5.6, 5.7 &amp; 5.8, will fail to deliver a genuine contribution to affordable housing provision at Spratton unless it is through rural exception sites. This is despite there being an identified “critical” need for affordable dwellings set out within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As a consequence, having regard to the definition of Sustainable Development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically the definition of the ‘social role’ at paragraph 7, the Plan would fail to “<i>contribute to the achievement of sustainable development</i>” (Schedule 4B, Paragraph 8(2)(d) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no evidence base to confirm that there are sufficient ‘smaller sites’ available and deliverable at Spratton to deliver the necessary housing provision. As the Draft Policy is very specific regarding locations that will be considered appropriate for residential development, yet does not seek to identify any sites, it is appropriate to assess the relevant land holdings that are available and the implications of their release.</p>	<p>The evidence base for the smaller scale developments of up to 10 units was provided by the September 2014 consultation.</p> <p>As regards the school, they made a statement in the public session of the Parish Council meeting on December 16 2014 and advised that ‘the budget was in good shape and the projection of pupil numbers were such that the Primary School was secure well into the future. Pupil numbers had risen by 10%. It was also reported that currently there were 60 children (spread over 3 classes) in the School and the optimum would be 4 classes (approx. 70 children).’</p> <p>As regards delivery of affordable units, we do not agree that a single large development at the start of the Plan period is the best solution. The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.</p> <p>As regards the application made by Mulberry developments, we would refer you to the reasons for refusal.</p> <p>See previous responses for any other matters raised here.</p>

		<p>Paragraph 184 of the NPPF makes clear that a Neighbourhood Plan “<i>should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies</i>”. This is a Parish which had 1,150 people within 498 dwellings at the time of the 2011 census, and proposes a housing policy that provides no certainty about the level or direction of growth. On the assumption that four sites of up to 10 units come forward over the Plan period to 2029, this would deliver a maximum of 40 new houses for the next 15 years, representing an increase of only 8% of the housing stock.</p> <p>The Parish Council submitted their application to designate a neighbourhood area in July 2012 on the basis of two main reasons: the first of which is the decline in local services. The level of residential development proposed over the 15 year Plan Period appears incapable of resolving this problem. By example, Spratton Primary School has a capacity of 120 pupils, but the numbers on the role are approximately only half of that figure. In light of the ageing population identified at Chapter 2 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan, the delivery of additional family in the village would clearly assist in sustaining the school.</p> <p>In light of the lack of affordable housing that will be delivered by Draft Policy HS1, and the lack of any certainty regarding the availability and deliverability of the land that the policy directs residential development towards, there is a need to reconsider the approach to housing delivery at Spratton.</p> <p>Mulberry maintain that there are significant benefits arising from delivery of a larger residential scheme than that allowed by the 10 dwelling or less approach currently presented. In addition to affordable housing provision, the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>economies of scale potentially make further community benefits a viable proposition. Mulberry therefore proposes that Draft Policy HS1 is amended to allow for larger scale development (at a level to be consulted upon with the community), so that confidence can be had in the benefits that will be delivered.</p> <p>In this context, the Parish has spent the last few years exploring the ability to deliver housing on one larger site, with an appropriate on-site affordable housing contribution, together with other community benefits. This had been narrowed down to two candidate sites. Neither of these sites has been discounted to date; the Parish Council merely sought to consider an alternative proposal in light of decisions made on other emerging Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Mulberry were responsible for the promotion of one of these sites, known as land off Brixworth Road (commonly referred to in the previous Neighbourhood Plan consultations as Site 2). Outline proposals have been prepared for this site which included ‘up to 37 dwellings, together with school amenity space, drop off/pick up area and 6 parking spaces for the primary school, access, public open space and associated infrastructure’. This scheme evidenced the community benefits that can be secured through a larger development, with the delivery of open market housing, affordable housing, additional play ground space for Spratton Primary School, 6 parking spaces and a drop-off/pick-up zone for the for the Primary School.</p> <p>These proposals are supported by technical evidence which confirmed that the site was deliverable. This information is submitted as an addendum to these representations for ease of reference, and comprises the following:</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>Site Location Plan  Site Layout Plan  Transport Statement (accompanied by Proposed Access Plan and Road Improvements Plan)  Flood Risk Assessment  Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment  Geophysical Survey  Archaeology – County Archaeologist advice (by email)  Ecological Assessment  Utility Assessment</p>	
	39	8.12-8.15	<p>Policy LD3 (on page 40) makes clear that residential development in accordance with Policy HS1 is an appropriate exception to the policy of restraint that the Pre-Deposit Draft Neighbourhood Plan seeks to apply to sites that are outside the Settlement Boundary but within the Special Landscape Area. The associated supporting text does not make this point. This is a critical matter and should be clarified within the supporting text at paragraphs 8.12 – 8.15.</p>	<p>We agree that, as currently written, this policy is not in accordance with policy EN1 of the Local Plan, Special Landscape Area and therefore is not at present in general conformity with this strategic policy. This particularly applies to the first 2 bullet points which do not allow for an assessment of the impact on the character of the Special Landscape Area. Therefore criteria needs to be included to allow for this. It is agreed that development within the Special Landscape Area that is adjacent to the settlement boundary should apply a set of criteria as suggested.</p>
	48	HP2	<p>Support is given to the thrust of the policy which states that <i>“proposals to provide new or improved pavement access within Spratton village will be strongly supported”</i>.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
			<p><u>Other matters - Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</u>  In the context of the Pre-Deposit Draft Neighbourhood Plan a copy of the documents relating to the SEA process were requested. Although we have not had sufficient time to review the documents in detail, it was considered to make brief comments.  First, it is apparent that the SEA process has been limited to a screening exercise. A concern regarding the screening exercise is that it has been undertaken at the end of the</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>process, rather than being undertaken at the start.</p> <p>Secondly, there are a number of legal challenges to emerging Neighbourhood Plans which have relevance to various SEA points. We reserve the right to reference these matters as the legal position gains greater certainty.</p>	
		<p><u>Other matters – Sustainability Appraisal (SA)</u></p> <p>While there is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to be accompanied by an SA, there is a need to demonstrate how the Plan will contribute to achieving sustainable development and an SA is an obvious way of achieving this.</p> <p>In the case of the draft Spratton Neighbourhood Plan, it is understood that an SA has not been completed and no evidence has been presented which provides confidence that the contribution to achieving sustainable development has been demonstrated.</p> <p>There are a number of legal challenges to emerging Neighbourhood Plans which have relevance to various SA points. We reserve the right to reference these matters as the legal position gains greater certainty.</p>	<p>At Submission Stage we will provide a Basic Conditions Statement which will have to demonstrate how the plan contributes towards achieving sustainable development.</p>
R Baillie		<p>There is a greater prominence of Spratton Hall School than Spratton Primary School. This has been done without justification therefore could be considered biased in favour of the Hall School and against the Primary School. I do not support the Neighbourhood Plan as it is.</p>	<p>Changed or added words agreed with the Primary School Para 2.13 ‘young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a rural community.’ to  <i>‘children needed to maintain a thriving primary school at the heart of the village and the young people that are needed to retain vibrancy in a village community.’</i>  Add to page 11, para 3.1, under Demographics, add the words in italics  An ageing population and low proportions of young people, particularly young families, <i>affecting community facilities such as the primary school..</i>  Change objective 7 throughout the document to</p>

				<p><i>‘Provide new community facilities and support existing community facilities to address identified needs of the community’</i></p> <p>Para 10.8 and policy HP2 (page 48), add  <i>‘Development should ensure that it encourages residents to walk around the village, so the safety of existing and any future walking routes especially relating to school and pupil movement should be carefully considered, and improved where possible.’</i></p> <p>Para 12.2, at the end of the first sentence after ‘where possible’ add  <i>‘especially its primary school, considered by many to be at the heart of the village contributing to its vibrancy.’</i></p>
	1	Map	The Recreation Ground "open space" shading has not been correctly done. As I understand it. The allotment adjacent to the Club area is privately owned land.	Thank you. It was intended not to include these allotments and there is a very fine area of white on the proposals map, but this will be increased.
	1	Map	The village envelope line along Smith Street seems to have changed since the 2003 drawing. Where is the justification for this?	<p>The 2003 version was not adopted. The Plan group has started from scratch, although cognisant of the earlier version. The inclusion of part of the Recreation Ground under new wording will be to allow the possibility of additional community facilities.</p> <p>Page 52, para 13.7 Replace existing words with <i>‘What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The</i></p>

				<i>policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.'</i>
	10	2.22	1 could see nothing in the Neighbourhood Plan which addresses pockets of deprivation	<p>From information from the social housing which makes up 10% of the village housing stock.</p> <p>A new policy will be inserted in clause 5.7 on page 15. Replace wording after the first sentence. The whole clause then to read.</p> <p><i>There is little or no available land within the settlement boundary, so the Plan proposes to allow small scale developments immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policies for the Plan were formulated at a time when the national threshold for requiring affordable housing units in a scheme was five. In November 2014, whilst the Plan was out for pre-submission consultation, central government increased this to ten units. Whilst Policy H2 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires affordable housing to be delivered at the rate of 40% for developments of 5 or more units, National Planning Practice Guidance sets a threshold of ten units, below which no on-site affordable housing provision can be sought. Therefore, the approach in the Neighbourhood Plan is that, if development proposals are below the threshold set by Planning Practice Guidance (such that no on-site affordable housing is provided), then the applicant must demonstrate the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>That a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would represent an inappropriate density of development, taking into account the size of the site and its location; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Through a viability appraisal that a scheme of at least fifteen residential units would not be</i></li> </ul>

				<p><i>commercially viable</i></p> <p>References to ten units will be changed to fifteen units. The Plan has a 15 year life span and a series of smaller developments, which are more likely to come on stream over the Plan period, is potentially more beneficial for the village than a single development in the first few years of the Plan, with no potential affordable units becoming available in the 2020s.</p> <p>Those who are concerned about a supply of affordable units should welcome the pro-growth policy of an undefined number of smaller developments over the 15-year Plan period.</p>
	11	3.1	Limited transport will mean that local facilities will need to be safeguarded against closure, particularly the Primary School. This should be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan.	The Plan refers to this and notes that its scope to address this is limited.
	13	Objective 4	<p>Spratton is already, to a large extent a dormitory village, with many households accessing private schools, shopping elsewhere and using leisure facilities outside the district. There is also a huge range within the "built form" throughout the village. For these residents it is quite likely they would not have an accurate appreciation of the importance of local facilities for residents who rely on these. The</p> <p>is essential for the future vibrancy of the village and with 88% in support of the Primary School (from October 2012 consultation) I would have thought this essential community facility would have more than a passing mention in the Neighbourhood Plan. Ensuring the future sustainability of the Primary School is crucial if the village is to be a thriving community in 2029</p>	<p>See response to your first question.</p> <p>Many changes or wording additions, to emphasise its importance, have been agreed with the Primary School.</p>
	14	4.4	Spratton Hall School should not be allowed any more open	The second sentence in para 4.4 (page 13) will be deleted,

			land for development than the Primary School. As it stands the Neighbourhood Plan advantages Spratton Hall School and at the same disadvantages Spratton Primary School. Surely the Primary School should be afforded the same "flexibility"-	and the settlement boundary will be re-drawn tighter to the school buildings.
	15	5.4	The future viability of the Primary School will be risked if it is not featured prominently in the Neighbourhood Plan.	See above. Many changes or wording additions, to emphasise its importance, have been agreed with the Primary School.
	15	SB1	Objective Four is not met if the primary school is unable to develop in the way it needs to between now and 2029.	Were the school to wish to expand with the support of the Local Education Authority, education would be a material consideration for expanding adjacent to the existing facility, albeit such development would accord with Policy SB1 of the Plan anyway.
	19	Photographs	The photographs used do not reflect the issue identified in 5.13. The photographs of the verge show multiple cars for one household. More than the average 2 cars per household. Using these photos as examples indicate a requirement that each new property would need around five off road parking spaces	Noted.
	26	7.6	Ownership of Rec needs to be explicitly stated.	1 Statement of ownership is not a matter for this document
	26	7.6	Ownership of the Allotments needs to be explicitly stated.	2 Statement of ownership is not a matter for this document
			Duplicate Photos Photos should not be duplicated. If necessary to use a photo in two parts of the report refer to the location of where the photo can be found.	Whilst this is almost certainly correct, we feel that it makes easier reference if they are.
	47	10.10	Any plans for pedestrian routes should also be considered as bridleways to assist in the reduction of horses needing to use the public highway, particularly busy roads. This will improve the safety of all roads in Spratton if there are more options for riding routes.	There is no evidence base (other than this single representation) for this change

	50	12.1	Also hairdresser and beauty salon.	Agreed, will be added
	50	12.3	The village DOES have a village hall. It doesn't have a village hall which is able to be used as a multi-function facility, eg: indoor sports, smaller meeting rooms, etc.	Agreed. Wording changes: Page 22, para 6.3 Change 'village hall' in last sentence to ' <i>community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i> ' and delete after the word 'development'. Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from 'new village hall' to ' <i>new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i> '. Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after 'community infrastructure' to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i> . Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.</i>
J Gaywood			I can't support the whole of the draft because of the process that has been used to consult on it. There is no closing time for the submission. The form asks you to submit on the Spratton Neighbourhood Draft Plan, however there are two draft plans on your website (draft and pre-submission draft). I understand that page and section numbers are required but the two drafts differ in	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue. But, in accordance with normal procedures, there is no time stated for formal consultations of this nature. The website shows the process of the development of the Plan with the latest information at the top – in order that people can see how the Plan has changed. Quoting of page and section numbers was a request only, and no representations were excluded because

			numbering which would lead you to believe that the content is different, in any case the numbering will be wrong. You cannot comment on things not included in the Plan as, if they are not included, then they don't have a page number, you have already informed me by e-mail that if they are not numbers they won't be included	they didn't.
			In the draft, p.37 or 38 dependant on what link you go from, under Figure 8.21 map the important walls leading up Smith street from Home Farm and to the right of the Hall School entrance have had the red line removed. That indicates protection for that wall in the VDS document that Figure 8.1 was lifted from. [Remainder of comments redacted on legal advice]	The map, Figure 8.1 is used solely for the matter of views and has no relevance to the over-arching policy for walls, dealt with in section 9 with a robust policy stating ' <i>Existing locally distinctive old cob, stone and brick boundary walls and buildings, thatched and slate roofs should be protected and conserved.</i> ' The map in figure 8.1 will be replaced by the one intended, with no walls marked. Furthermore 'Loss of distinctive cob, stone and brick boundary walls' will be added to the list of adverse impacts in section 5.14 on page 17.
			I request that you publish the numbers of forms submitted and the number of yes and No. This consultation should be considered null and void and a re-consultation happen	This was a consultation not a referendum
A Holland	6	2.8	There are 2 adjoined cob properties (est. 1800's) situated on the junction of Smith Street and High Street (27 and 28 Smith Street) which add to the historic picture of the village. These are currently missing from the map.	Thank you. We did not know this until very recently. New version to be included.
	18	5.22	Whilst mentioning vehicle parking on new developments, attention should be drawn to existing vehicle access when considering new sites. For example the current traffic conditions on Smith Street would need to be heavily considered for new development plans on the North side of the village .Smith Street already will have additional traffic from the new development on Manor Road/High Street in addition to the School traffic. Effectively the road is one	The Plan makes no allocation of sites,. Any will be considered on their merits.

			lane wide due to residents parking up from the High Street, making the existing speed/visibility situation dangerous, especially with 2 crossing points for children.	
	36	8.4	"General lack of trees" - fails to mention the trees on the public footpath between Smith Street and the Cemetery	These are on private land.
	37	8.10	View B - also extends from further down the footpath (not just from the top field as currently annotated)	Views are as shown in the Village Design Statement
	40	8.16	Due to topography of the village, should a statement about minimising light pollution from developments on higher ground be considered; and lower ground development would be beneficial to satisfy this point	See Policy LD4 on page 40.
	50	12.1	No post office in the village, although listed in the community facilities. No mention of hairdressers or beauty salon.	Noted and will be rectified.
	50	12.4	Village hall already in existence on School Road, yet mentioned that a need for a dedicated village hall is required?	<p>This aspiration was reported at a well-attended extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council on 5 March 2014.</p> <p>Wording changes:</p> <p>Page 22, para 6.3 Change 'village hall' in last sentence to '<i>community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i>' and delete after the word 'development'.</p> <p>Page 26, para 7.7 Change the reference in this clause from 'new village hall' to '<i>new community facilities including, for example, a new village hall</i>'.</p> <p>Page 28, Policy LG1, in the last bullet point change words after 'community infrastructure' to <i>including, for example, a new village hall proposed in Policy CF1</i>.</p> <p>Page 50, para 12.3 Replace with <i>What the village lacks at present is a village hall commensurate with other comparable sized villages in the</i></p>

				<i>locality. The current hall, built in 1928, is small and in need of upgrade to bring it up to modern standards. In addition, it has no dedicated parking so users have to park on the neighbouring streets, causing amenity issues for residents. The Plan includes a policy to provide modern purpose-built facilities to serve all sections and age groups of the community and provide a wide range of community, social and sporting functions, and maybe even incubator business office space. The policy suggests that the Recreation Ground is the most likely location with this having been under discussion right back to 1950.</i>
	xv ii		No mention of the listed 'Home Farm' building and adjoining wall (bottom of Smith Street)? This view from Smith Street down to the farm can also be considered an important 'village' view, especially alongside the rolling banks and open views to the North from the footpath which should be considered alongside the other examples. Why is this not included in the plan?	Home Farm will appear in a new section on Listed Buildings. Views are as shown in the Village Design Statement. Views, and any other matters will be periodically reviewed during the term of this Plan.
			I have many other comments which I feel need to 'protect' the village which may not fall into a specific section, for example, focus on the future of the school (the school I only found mentioned once in the whole document); the focus on reducing traffic within the existing village roads to increase safety to residents and our children is lacking. Let's make sure this opportunity is not missed and the parishioners are able to have a say in this process as 'their' plan. I look forward to seeing the output of all the comments received in response to the plan to date.	All comments will be posted soon after receipt, and responses when these have been agreed.
B Gascoin			Please disregard my previous form; I realise I was not then in full cognisance of the facts and mistook the position of one of the sites	Noted

R. Abbott Mrs Anderson D Ball S Ball L Branson C Bromley I Bromley M Brown F Bruten S Bruten R Bucknold A Burnell C Campbell M Campbell J Cantam N Cantam L Clark E Costello D Flower L Flower J Ford S Foster T George T Greenwood B Hollowell F Hollowell N Hollowell Y Holmes D Horne S Horne			75 forms	No comments were made about the Plan.
---	--	--	----------	---------------------------------------

S Jones H Kelly G Lack D Letten P Lyon A Love A Martin A Martin B Martin C Martin C Martin H Martin S Mayfield C Miller L Miller L Moore P Morris J Penton- Harper T Reynolds F Ritchie F Roseblade P Roseblade C Scarth D Scarth T Scarth L Skinner J Slow K Smith J Spence S Spence I Spiers				
---	--	--	--	--

L Stonestreet T Stonestreet R Taylor J Tobbutt C Wright K Wright H Willson A Wykes A Wykes B Wykes E Wykes M Wykes P Wykes S Wykes				
A Penton- Harper S Penton- Harper S Penton- Harper			3 forms entirely blank with no marks other than name and address	

11. The following Statutory Consultees were consulted:

- Daventry District Council (Local Planning Authority)
- Northants County Council (General Planning)
- Northants County Council (Education)
- Northants County Council (Highways)
- Northampton Borough Council (Adjoining Local Planning Authority)
- Brixworth Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Creaton Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Cottesbrooke Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Church with Chapel Brampton Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Guilsborough Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Holdenby Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Hollowell Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Pitsford Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Ravensthorpe Parish Council (Adjoining Parish Council)
- Barry Frenchman Spratton ward councillor
- John Shephard Spratton ward councillor
- Bryn Aldridge Ravensthorpe ward councillor
- Ian Barrett Brixworth ward councillor
- Kevin Parker Brixworth ward councillor
- Elizabeth Wiig Brixworth ward councillor
- Coal Authority
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- Marine Management Organisation
- Environment Agency
- Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage)
- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited - (company number 2904587)
- Highways Agency
- BT
- Mobile phone mast operators
- NHS England
- National Grid
- Anglian Water (Sewerage)
- Anglian Water (Water undertaker)
- Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire
- St Andrews Church
- Daventry and District Disability Access Forum
- Daventry and District Civic Society
- Spratton Local History Society

12. We requested a screening opinion from Daventry District Council on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment by e-mail on 5 October 2014, and they acknowledged that they would do so by e-mail on 7 October 2014. They contacted the following statutory bodies by e-mail on 22 October 2014, inviting them to respond and they replied on the dates below
- |                    |                  |
|--------------------|------------------|
| English Heritage   | 19 November 2014 |
| Environment Agency | 26 November 2014 |
| Natural England    | 10 November 2014 |

By e-mail dated 2 December 2014, Daventry District Council submitted their screening report dated November 2014, and confirmed that ‘no further assessment work is required regarding Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulations Assessment’.

13. Barry Frenchman, chair of Spratton Parish Council and a Daventry District Councillor forwarded copy of the Pre-Submission Plan (via e-mail link) to all district councillors on 30 October 2014.