



SPRATTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Summary of responses received at Regulation 16 stage (submission)

Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendum) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

The following table comprises a summary of the responses received to the submission consultation of the Spratton Neighbourhood Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing her assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Spratton Neighbourhood Plan. Where significant representations were received the summary and conclusions provided by the respondent have been used to populate the tables below. The summary of comments reflects the views put forward by the consultee and are abridged as faithfully as possible to ensure that the purpose of the original representation is maintained. The responses can be reviewed in full on the DDC website at: <https://www.davertrydc.gov.uk/living/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/spratton/>

Responses received to the submission consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner.

Respondent	Support/Object/ Comment	Summary of response
Anglian Water	Comment	Identifies that development in Spratton Parish will have an impact on Brixworth Water Recycling Centre (WRC) formally known as a sewage treatment works. The used water flows would also have an impact on the existing used water network. The used water requirements will be dependent on the location, size and phasing of development and all sites will require location connection to the network which may include network upgrades. The neighbourhood plan outlines criteria for assessing development proposals but do not identify the scale of development. Anglian water would wish to comment further on these issues as part of the planning application process.
Barry Frenchman	Support	Production of plan has been a long and careful process which much consultation. The future vibrancy of the village and its facilities is an important factor to most villages but careful management is needed to manage any growth so as to not spoil what makes Spratton special.
Melvyn Blowfield	Support	Well thought out plan that has been subject to several consultations within Spratton and seems to offer a balanced proposal.

<p>Daventry Council</p>	<p>District</p>	<p>Comment and Object</p>	<p>Include labelling (numeric or alphabetic) of criteria of each policy</p> <p>Policy HS1 should make reference to policy R1 of the WNJCS</p> <p>Policy HS2 – replace bullet points 3 and 4 with single bullet point that refers to ‘protecting the amenity of existing residents’</p> <p>Policy HD1- To ensure the plan is appropriate having regard to the NPPF replace criteria 3 and 4 with ‘extensions should respect the character of the village and use materials that match the existing building’</p> <p>LG1- further evidence could be included to support the inclusion of the Local Green Spaces.</p>
<p>Fisher German</p>		<p>Object</p>	<p>Policy SB1 – does not conform with policy R1 of the WNJCS as it does not identify how much housing is required, where Spratton sites within the hierarchy and what housing is required to address that need.</p> <p>Policy HS1 – no explanation or justification as to where the level of 15 dwellings arises. The reference to ‘immediately adjacent to the village settlement boundary’ needs to be changed as this will not allow for land to be developed as it is currently drawn making it unworkable</p> <p>Proposals Map- needs to be revised to include land in urban use and land that is allocated</p> <p>Objective 6 - plan needs to be revised to address this objective relating to traffic, parking and pedestrian movement.</p>

Northamptonshire County Council	Comment	LD5- Enhancing Woodland Areas- accept that planting can be beneficial but it should not occur within areas of archeological sensitivity including undesigantated heritage assets as this would be contrary to objective 2 of the plan.
Lucille Knapp	Comment	Concerned that the amount of traffic along quieter parts of the village is addressed in the plan, in particular vibrations caused by traffic causing problems for older buildings/structures on Yew Tree Lane and Holdenby Road
Michael Heaton	Support	A well-considered, comprehensive and balanced plan
Norma and Allan Simons	Object	Understand a lot of work has gone into production of document but cannot agree with content as it is based on misleading questionnaires. The draft has many contradictions concerning affordable housing and smaller sites.
Natural England	Comment	Natural England commented to the Draft consultation of the Spratton Neighbourhood Development Plan and to the SEA/HRA Screening opinion and I can confirm that we have no further comments to add at this stage. We can confirm however that we consider that the basic conditions for the neighbourhood plan have been met.
Network Rail	Comment	No comments
Pegasus Group	Comment and Object	Incorrect reference to the Development Plan as it should refer to the WNJCS and the

		<p>1997 saved Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy SB1 - Question whether a blanket approach to a restriction of development outside or adjacent to the settlement boundary is consistent with the NPPG as this recognizes that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas. Don't consider that the plan is truly flexible as to delivering residential development as there is a contradiction between policy SB1 and the description of the settlement boundary in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.4.</p> <p>Policy HS1 - no cross referencing to policy SB1. Propose that the first criterion of policy HS1 is changed.</p> <p>The plan is silent on the quantitative requirements identified for the rural areas in the WNJCS. Concern about the threshold of 15 dwellings and the impact on the plans ability to meet its own objectives. This should be removed.</p> <p>Policy HS1 – does not meet objectives of Neighbourhood plan relating to providing new and/or enhancing existing facilities</p> <p>Policy LD3 – contradiction with HS1 and contradiction between policy justification and the policy. Also no reference to 'exceptional circumstances' within the policy.</p> <p>Lack of reference to the supply/delivery of housing leads to a failure to meet the basic conditions.</p>
Wilbraham Associates	Object	<p>Policy SB1 - To accord with the development plan the plan should clarify whether the village falls within either a primary or secondary service village referred to in policy R1. The plan should take into account any housing need when establishing the</p>

		<p>settlement boundary.</p> <p>Proposals Map- Objection is made to the proposals map as the boundary appears arbitrary in certain areas and the boundary is based on an out-of-date local plan policy, HS22 which itself conflicts with policy R1. The boundary is also incorrectly mapped as it should include 'urban' features such as the car park and all weather tennis courts at Spratton hall School.</p> <p>Policy HS1 – this is in conflict with policy R1 because it allows development adjacent to the village boundary.</p> <p>There is insufficient justification for a restriction of 15 dwellings.</p> <p>There is no policy within the plan to address objective 6- traffic, parking and pedestrian movement.</p>
Sue Matthews	Object and Comment	<p>Uncertainty about the impact of new housing and how much affordable housing will be delivered without allocated sites. Such developments may also cause highway safety issues.</p> <p>Support the delivery of housing at a site off Brixworth Road which would help deliver improved connections to Brixworth.</p> <p>The new village hall is unlikely to be viable as there are adequate existing facilities available in the village.</p> <p>Raised question marks about the validity of the research due to the ambiguity of the questionnaires.</p>