



GUILSBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT 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 Guilsborough Neighbourhood Development Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing her assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Guilsborough 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:

www.daventrydc.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning

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

Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of response
Andrea King	Support	The plan has been developed taking into account the needs of the community as a whole as well as local and national planning parameters. The process has been thorough and collaborative, allowing plenty of opportunity for feedback. I support the final plan.
Nigel Townsend on behalf of self build group	Support	The self build group wish to undertake a bespoke small development at the edge of Guilsborough village. The group wish to register enthusiastic support for the submitted neighbourhood plan. It is highly detailed and an appropriate reflection of the needs and pressures of the community. The neighbourhood plan recognises the housing need of the village and the plan makes reference to 'downsizing' and 'small bungalows'. The group do not agree that this is the best way of designing or describing homes for the specific sector of need related to older people. Solely reducing the size of homes is not considered to be the best way to meet this need. Instead it is better to promote older residents living together in well designed properties to avoid the need for institutional living. The representation also sets out key features that should be considered within the design or such housing including single level and flexible layout. A design concept document for the promoted site accompanies the representation and includes car parking for the church.
Chris Nolan	Comment	Open Space G2 - There is no obvious evidence of Saxon fishpond or Roman association with this area as claimed. Access is limited very much to the public footpath and it is not massively used, but otherwise the field is private paddock and hobbyfarm cattle. Open Space G4 - There is no public access here, nor within 50m of it. The public cannot even see it unless they access Google Earth. Again this is an area of private paddocks and hobbyfarm sheep. This is not actually an area that serves the community at all, and in the case of G2 only in a very limited way. Heritage Asset H1 - Roman area and Guilsborough Hall Park. No one in

		<p>Guilsborough has ever heard of Guilsborough Hall ‘Park’ before. Guilsborough Hall, like Guilsborough Grange, was a former big house and grounds but is now long gone. Guilsborough Grange (which still exists) gets not a single mention in this entire massive document, despite having been home to Guilsborough Zoo and having several other public legacy features (including some TPO’s recently bestowed by the council). The archaeological case for the creation of H1 seems based largely upon amateur internet searches in the main, but are being presented as fact to a somewhat bemused public.</p> <p>Heritage Asset H2 – It’s not for the public to label something like this as being of vital national significance.</p>
Barton Willmore	Object	<p>There is a lack of certainty on housing delivery within the village, which will only exacerbate existing and worsening affordability issues. This would not lead to sustainable development within Guilsborough. Promoting a site, to the west of Coton Road, would help in this respect, particularly with the delivery of affordable housing. The designation of part of this site as formal Open Space would undermine this and, regardless of its developability, we consider the designation is flawed and should not be taken forward as part of the Plan to again ensure conformity with the adopted Development Plan, the emerging Local Plan and national planning policy guidance. We consider that the above changes would help ensure the GNDP meets the basic conditions as set out in the legislation.</p>
Daventry District Council	Comment	<p>Throughout the plan, references to the emerging Settlements and Countryside Local Plan should be clear that the plan is emerging and not adopted. Some clarity is requested on a number of issues including that the neighbourhood plan only needs to be in general conformity with strategic policies in the Local Plan, the fact that planning applications are determined on their own merits and that proposed development only needs to mitigate its own impacts. Some amendments to various policies in the plan are also requested to ensure there is no conflict with other parts of the plan. There are also some factual updates. Policy 10 that refers to Guilsborough Academy requires changes. As currently drafted this places unreasonable conditions on any proposed development. Policy 11 requires amendments in order to have full regard to national planning policy</p>

		and legislation related to heritage assets.
Graham Byars	Support	Policies 1-3, 4, 6 and 8-11 are supported.
Lee Edmonds	Support	The development plan is clearly a comprehensive document, showing a clear direction of how Guilsborough could be allowed to grow over the short and medium term. Although I fully support the plan, I remain cautious about just where planning for 28 houses (maximum of 10 dwellings within one development) would actually be permitted.
Northamptonshire County Council Archaeological Advisor	Support	Policies 1, 2, 3 and 8 contain references to the management and enhancement of the historic environment while recognising that an element of sensitive development is required to maintain the vibrancy of the village.
Mark Webster	Support	Express full support for this plan
Francis Jackson Homes	Object	Para 92 fails to meet the Basic Conditions test as it is too restrictive in its wording and does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and fails to conform with the strategic policies in the Development Plan. The list of 'exceptional circumstances' is more restrictive than the emerging SCLP2 policy RA2. The representation sets out alternative wording.
	Object	Object to the wording of draft Policy 2 as it is not in general conformity with the higher tier Development Plan (specifically policy RA2 of the emerging SCLP). The specific wording of the policy will provide no opportunity to plan positively for local housing need or deliver the housing aspirations of the local community. It is overly prescriptive by requiring development to be immediately adjacent to the confines.
	Support	Support the aspirations for circa 28 dwellings over the plan period however the plan must ensure that these aspirations are fully achievable and suitable sites are available. To ensure this need can be genuinely met over the plan period, a number of sites should be allocated.
	Object	Significant discussion in paras 115-136 regarding local housing need, tenures, sizes and typologies is not reflected in policies 3 (Housing General) or 4 (Affordable Housing). In order to be capable of delivering the level of aspirational housing, this should be reflected in the policy and an assessment of individual genuinely deliverable sites should be made to ensure this need can be met. Site on West Haddon Road promoted.
	Object	The parking standards for 5/5 bedroom homes are too onerous and would result

		in development that is not in keeping with the local character and context therefore resulting in conflict with the design policy of the plan. The policy should be more flexible.
Simon Moorhead	Support	Overall support for the plan. This is a diligent, thoroughly considered proposal which has been tested with local residents. Particularly support the primary housing recommendation of limited long term residential growth in small developments within the boundaries of Guilsborough village. Support the references to access and traffic movements being a constraining factor for more aggressive growth in the village.
	Object	The village confines boundary should adhere to property boundaries and not cross through them in order to ensure sustainable development
	Object	The General Development policy should include consideration of height and elevation of the land in planning decisions.
Northamptonshire County Council Development Management	Comment	Representation sets out the requirement for contributions to education, fire and rescue, libraries and broadband that would be required from development in Guilsborough in accordance with the County Council's adopted Planning Obligations Framework and Guidance Document "Creating Sustainable Communities – Jan 2015".
Anglian Water	Support	We note that changes have made in response to Anglian Water's comments in relation to Policy 9 (formerly policy 8) of the Neighbourhood Plan. The changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan address our previous concerns relating to Hollowell Reservoir.
Fisher German	Object	Para 166 - The plan states that any potential future extension to the Solar Farm, will impact the long view from Cold Ashby Road, it will not as the existing Solar Farm cannot be seen from Cold Ashby Road. In relation to the Playing Field and the short view the adjacent land owner has already planted a hedge 4 years ago that is maturing and will therefore screen any potential impact if any in this regard.
	Object	Page 46, view 4 - It refers to Guilsborough Grange, which is incorrect it is in fact Nortoft Grange
	Object	Para 190 - The plan incorrectly states that public access is "under threat". The landowner has clearly stated that it is not, access is currently granted on a permissive basis, under a countryside stewardship agreement, when this

		agreement comes to an end in 2019, the landowner intends to continue to allow permitted access on a similar basis and in the same way that they currently do. It should however be noted this is a permissive right and can be withdrawn by the landowner at any time, if circumstances should change, but there is no intention or wish to do so at the present time.
Catherine Letts	Comment	Owner of land west of Church Way and included in the area marked red in the section of the plan "Historic Fort" "G4". Would like previously submitted comments to be considered.
Andrew Pearse	Support	I am fully supporting of the Plan in its entirety.
Historic England	Comment	The area covered by the neighbourhood plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. The strategy should ensure that these are safeguarded in line with national planning policy.
National Grid	Comment	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Natural England	Comment	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.
NCC – Lead Local Flood Authority	Comment	The Guilsborough Neighbourhood Plan does not take into account flood risk or flood risk management. The plan identifies a single major development of approximately 12 dwellings at a location yet to be agreed. The requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to mitigate flood risk for new development on both greenfield and brownfield sites has not been included. Additional wording is suggested.
Sarah Dalzell	Support	I fully support the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. This plan shows that considerable time and effort has been made by the Parish Council to fully consult all the villagers, and to represent their views.
Seatons Stores	Object	Since the neighbourhood plan process began, a clear shortage of houses has been identified nationally. It is disappointing that the neighbourhood plan seeks to seriously limit the building of new houses by restricting development to within the village confines. Concerned there will be insufficient population growth in

		Guilsborough to support existing services and facilities unless further building is allowed outside the village confines.
	Object	Seatons shop, post office and business centre is not a community asset but a privately owned building. It is to the benefit of those who use it however object to restrictions being imposed on the buildings future use by requiring active marketing for 12 months.
Sue O'Neill	Support	<p>Support all the policies in the Guilsborough Neighbourhood Development Plan. Specifically support the balance between the new housing and the protection of landscape, heritage and community assets. I welcome the limit on the size of individual housing developments, to about 12 houses as this allows some affordable housing, but retains the sensitive village character. I would like to see any development spread over the whole plan period.</p> <p>I would be concerned if larger housing developments had any significant impact on the Special Landscape Area, including the open ridgeline views in and out the village.</p> <p>I note the Parish Council had a presentation about a small development of about 4 or 5 houses on the field south of the Coton Road, close to the church. This would be appropriate if it was landscaped.</p> <p>I note the continued representations of the landowner for a site with a previous refused application for 28 houses adjacent to the GP Surgery, and would object to that as the scale would be far too large, and likely to have a significant negative impact on the views in and out of the village.</p> <p>The protection of the Recreation Ground as Local Green Space/Public Open Space is essential.</p>