

MAIDWELL WITH DRAUGHTON 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 Maidwell with Draughton Neighbourhood Development Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing her assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Maidwell with Draughton 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 consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner

Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of response
MwD01 Historic England	Comment	We have no further comment to make to our letter of 6 th April 2018, which is attached for your reference.
MwD02 Sport England	Comment	<p>The NPPF identifies how the planning system can play an important part in social interaction and creating healthy inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active is an important part of this. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. It is important to positively plan for sport, protect sports facilities from unnecessary loss and have an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment with community facilities.</p> <p>It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport in the NPPF. Sport England is a statutory consultee in protecting playing fields and the presumption against loss. Sport England has produced a playing field policy and guidance on developing planning policy for sport.</p> <p>A neighbourhood planning body should see if the local authority has a playing pitch strategy or indoor/outdoor facility strategy, which could be useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan. The neighbourhood plan should reflect the strategy, including those that relate to the neighbourhood area and use local investment opportunities such as CIL to support their delivery. Where such evidence does not exist policies should be based on a proportionate assessment of the area's needs. Key recommendations and deliverable actions should be developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community to set out required future provision based on needs.</p> <p>Sport England has produced design guidance notes for the design of new or improved sports facilities.</p> <p>Any new housing development will generate additional demands for sport. If existing facilities do not have capacity planning policies should ensure that new facilities or improvements to existing facilities are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet demand should accord with any approved local policies and pitch/facility strategy. Consideration should be given to how any new development, especially housing, will provide opportunities for healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to develop policies or assess proposals. The guidance can be used during the evidence gathering stage to</p>

		undertake an assessment of how the area could be improved to encourage active lifestyles.
MwD03 Mr P Turland	Support	Believe that the submitted plan meets the basic conditions. There was reasonable consultation and ample opportunity to provide feedback during the development of the plan, which is cognisant of the requirements of the local community, other stakeholders and appropriate local & national policies. I support the submitted plan.
	Comment	Key to Appendix A contains typographical and factual errors.
MwD04 Anglian Water	Object	There are existing sewers or water mains in the ownership of Anglian Water located within the boundaries of a number of the designated local green spaces at Maidwell and Draughton. The policy as drafted states that development within the designated green spaces will only be allowed in very exceptional circumstances. However no further guidance is provided about what would constitute very exceptional circumstances in this context. It is therefore suggested that Policy MD2 should be amended to include reference to the circumstances in which development would be permitted would be permitted in the designated local green spaces included utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water.
MwD05 Mr R Barnes	Comment	The proposed village confines exclude part of the gardens of a number of houses on Draughton Road, including my garden. I remain unclear as to the rationale for this and of any implications for the affected residents. The reference to “a reasonably equitable area of garden land behind all the houses and garages on the east side of Harborough Road” does not help me. I am optimistically inclined to believe that the negative implications for us are minimal or non-existent but clarification would be appreciated.
	Comment	The Traffic Management elements of the Plan are particularly important for the village in terms of residents’ safety and maintaining its attractive and rural aspect. There are a number of critical areas along Draughton Road and the A508. Although I do not detect any cause for optimism about improvements being made in the foreseeable future, I do think this matter is fundamental to maintaining the character of the village and the quality of life of the residents.
MwD06 Network Rail	Comment	Network Rail has no comments.
MwD07 Mr P Coulson	Comment	As you can see from the enclosed plan the new proposed line slices my garden in two. The proposed original one goes round my perimeter, I think to leave it as proposed would be much more natural. I also enclose photos of the garden taken approx. 15 years ago as it has been garden for approx. 32 years, the hedges, trees are much bigger now.
MwD08 Maidwell Hall School	Object	Object to the exclusion of Maidwell Hall from the village plan, which contravenes MD4. Maidwell Hall is a Grade 2 listed building and it represents a major part of the heritage of the village. As a residence it has been central to the village settlement for 500 years and to exclude it from the confines of the village is to rewrite history. Maidwell Hall is the main residence of the Headmaster and his family and it is not just a school. The school has a close

		relationship with the village and in particular the Church, which would struggle to survive financially without the school's support, and the primary school which uses school facilities, in particular the swimming pool. The hall and grounds are self-evidently not part of open countryside. Reference by DDC to the wooded area of the grounds refers to landscape woodland known as 'wilderness'; this is not agricultural in any way. Indeed, the grounds of Maidwell Hall contain very rare trees and plants and all the trees have TPO's. The fish pond of the Hall is a village heritage asset. One of the main objectives of the neighbourhood plan is to protect landscape and heritage. Excluding Maidwell Hall contravenes this objective.
	Object	Object to the exclusion of Maidwell Hall from the confines of the village because it contravenes MD7. Maidwell Hall School is a major rural employer. The school employs 50 people which makes it the major economic contributor in the village. Plans for the development of the school via new approved buildings and growth in pupil numbers will benefit the economy of the village and rural area. The neighbourhood plan makes reference to this on page 12 and yet the school has been excluded from the village confines. This makes no sense. The school is totally part of the village and there has always been a close symbiosis between the school and the village. The boarding nature of the school means that there are 100 or so children effectively living in the school and part of the village community. They may not be on the village census but they still form part of the village community. It is quite wrong for a residential building of this size and importance to be excluded from the village as defined by the proposed new village boundary.
	Object	Object to the proposed village confines. Not only is Maidwell Hall excluded but other houses are left outside the village confines which are self-evidently part of the village: For example, Hall Farm, Paines Close, Barn Hill, the Old Police House. It is very strange that the relatively new Blueberry Lane houses are included but other older houses are left out. There is no logic to this at all. DDC seems to want to draw straight lines where in fact the shape of the village does not run in straight lines. I also object to the proposed village confines because they are so tight that they leave little room for the development that respondents have identified. 4.5.4 on page 25 of the plan indicated 13-14 dwellings over the plan period in Maidwell. It is difficult to see how this could be achieved with the proposed confines boundary which would therefore contravene a key objective of the plan.
	Object	Object to the definition of Maidwell as an 'Other Village'. In fact it should be categorised as a 'Secondary Service Village'. I refer to 2.6.4 on page 7. The Local Plan (Part 2A) methodology makes it clear that a 'Secondary Service Village' must have a score of 47. Maidwell scores 10 in each of the most important services and facilities: Secondary School (Maidwell Hall), Primary School, Community Hall and Village Church, Public House and Restaurant, and 5 in terms of local employment, and if the daily bus service is working properly there is another 5 points for that. This totals 50 points which is enough for a 'secondary service village' There is also a proposal for a coffee shop to be located in the pub. It should also be noted that

		Maidwell Hall school provides services that are made available to the village at certain times, such as the cricket pitch and the Oliver Wyatt Hall for concerts and plays. The school swimming pool is made available for the village via the weekly use of the primary school. There are thus other facilities which increase the score beyond 50 if they are quantified correctly. At present it would seem that the scoring for Maidwell has taken no account whatsoever of the services and facilities provided by Maidwell Hall School. This is a serious omission for all sorts of reasons.
MwD09 Mrs E Arnold	Comment	I wish to record the following comment on the Maidwell and District Neighbourhood Plan recently prepared by the village representatives. In the new plan the village boundary on the south side on the west side of the A508, goes down the fence of Hall Farm house, thus placing the former Police House which is further along the road towards Northampton, outside the village, which seems illogical since the house has been there since 1936. When we purchased the house in 1970 the village boundary was shown as going down the fence of its garden on the Northampton side and along the fence at the bottom of the garden. Why should this change take place?
MwD10 Mr C Rabjohn	Comment	I have a small observation about one of the maps. Map 3 – Important Open Spaces – Maidwell. Area B (Recreation Area) is shown as extending to the stream (ditch) to the west. I believe that this is incorrect. I believe that it only extends to a line that is a continuation of the western boundaries of Burrowdale & Church House (the 2 properties to the south of the recreation area). If you “go on safari” in the undergrowth, you will see the remains of the fence line.
MwD11 Mr S Bates	Comment	Object in the strongest possible words to the Council’s reaction to the neighbourhood plan that has been put forward by Maidwell and Draughton. Pete Redman and his steering committee have put in a massive amount of work on this over many months. They consulted our community to ask for our thoughts and wishes and put these forward to the Council. It seems that all this has been totally ignored. The “red line” defining open countryside and residential/garden areas which we put forward has been redrawn to include many areas of garden and domestic use as “open countryside”. How can garden sheds, car parks and flower beds be open countryside? Maidwell and Draughton is an important parish employing many people. We have a Pub, 2 schools, 2 village halls and 2 Churches. We wish there to be provision for a small amount of residential growth within the confines however there will be no opportunity for this under the Council’s proposed Village confines.
MwD12 Mr C & Mrs A Rabjohn	Support	We have now had the opportunity to review the revised plan for Maidwell and Draughton. We are happy with its content and fully support the revised “development envelope” (Purple line).
MwD13 AS Palmer	Comment	At a recent village meeting I noticed that Daventry District Council was thinking about reducing

		<p>the size of Maidwell by moving the village confines. This movement put the village line through home owners' gardens and even more importantly excluding Maidwell Hall School from the village. This is the most appalling thing I have ever heard. Have you actually looked at the history of Maidwell.</p> <p>At the time of Edward the Confessor Maidwell belonged to Saxon Lords Godric and Leofric. This dual ownership meant there were two manor houses and two churches. One of the manor houses was built on the site where Maidwell Hall School is now and was next to the church in the village of Maidwell. The other Manor House and church have since disappeared. Are we now going to lose the remaining Manor House from the village boundary and split it from our church. I ask you to reconsider your proposed boundary of our village with this important history in mind.</p>
MwD14 Mrs D Simmons	Support	Having looked at the proposed Neighbourhood Plan for the above villages, I agree with the proposed plans.
MwD15 Daventry District Council	Comment	Various comments about policies maps including local designations, notations and confines.
	Comment	Para 2.3 - neighbourhood plan policies may be superseded by strategic or non-strategic policies that are subsequently adopted.
	Comment	Factual corrections needed at paras 2.6.1, 2.6.4, 4.1.1.3, 4.3.4 and section 5,
	Comment	Clarification needed in section 3 that Consultation Statement contains full details of consultation.
	Comment	If the neighbourhood plan wishes to designate an area of local high quality landscape that will endure beyond the adoption date of the Part 2 Local Plan, it needs to be supported by appropriate evidence, which has not been produced. This could be addressed in a review of the neighbourhood plan and referenced in the Monitoring and Review section.
	Comment	Draughton is identified as a Small Settlement/Hamlet in the emerging Part 2 Local Plan which is not a sustainable location for additional development unless there are special circumstances. The Council acknowledges that the neighbourhood plan has aspirations for some development over the plan period and recommends an amendment.
	Comment	The list in the first paragraph on page 14 of core issues should include local economy/employment and traffic management/transport.
	Comment	<p>MD1 - there is inconsistency in the terms used for village confines (also called limits for development boundary) in the policy and supporting text. "village confines" should be used to be consistent with the Part 2 Local Plan and other neighbourhood plans in the District.</p> <p>"Substantial change" would not be appropriate for Draughton due to its position in the settlement hierarchy.</p>

		The policy refers to important views within the village, however, these have not been defined on the policies map and it is unclear whether they have ever been defined or consulted on. Delete reference to important views.
	Comment	MD2a - NPPF assessment, photographs and maps should be moved to the supporting text. Amendments to the policy are suggested.
	Comment	MD2b - terms “diversity” and “enabling development” are inappropriate in this context. Policy is too restrictive because many of the green spaces are highway verges.
	Comment	MD3b - Special Landscape Area’s special qualities should be reflected in the policy. Amendments to the policy are suggested.
	Comment	MD3c - as a Local Wildlife Site the Brampton Valley Way should be listed in the policy and shown on the Policies Map. The policy gives local sites too much protection and is therefore contrary to the NPPF. An amendment to the policy is suggested.
	Comment	MD4 – the Local List has not been evidenced against published criteria such as that produced by Historic England. The Council is compiling a Local List and would be prepared to consider assets identified through a neighbourhood plan, however, because of the lack of evidence, the Council cannot at this stage endorse the assets identified as part of the official Local List. The neighbourhood plan should describe them as non-designated heritage assets that would be subject to further discussion with the District Council.
	Comment	Policy MD6 and the supporting text refer to local character, key attributes and design features, however, these have not been defined. Examples of key local character features should be set out in the supporting text with a reference in the policy. Amendments to the policy are suggested.
	Comment	MD8 – the requirement that alternative provision should be accessible by public transport would not be realistic in all cases. Amendments to the policy are suggested.
	Comment	Minor comments on sections 8 and 9.
MwD16 Natural England	Comment	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Maidwell with Draughton Neighbourhood Development Plan, submission consultation. However, the attached annex covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a neighbourhood plan.
MwD17 Mr T Simmons	Support	I've reviewed the latest version of the above plan and give my approval. I am a resident of Maidwell.
MwD18 Gladman Devts. Ltd.	Comment	The MDNP should provide flexibility to ensure that its policies are not overridden by the future adoption of any local plan. Some of the policies do not meet the requirements of national policy and guidance. Because submission will be after 24 th January 2019, comments relate to the most recent 2018 NPPF.
	Object	MD1 – object to the use of settlement boundaries if these preclude sustainable development.

		This is an overly restrictive approach and provides no flexibility. Use of boundaries to artificially restrict suitable development does not accord with the positive approach to growth in the Framework and is contrary to basic condition a).
	Comment	MD2a & MD2b – policy seeks to designate 17 LGSs. The Parish Council must ensure that these meet the NPPF requirements/tests. Do not consider that the grass verges meet criteria b) or c).
	Comment	MD5 – policy should be worded to allow flexibility for changing needs. An amendment to the policy is suggested.
MwD19 Environment Agency	Support	N/A
MwD20 Mr J Crook	Support	I support the Maidwell & Draughton Neighbourhood Plan Submission Consultation Regulation 16 and that it meets the basic conditions.
MwD21 Mrs J Bonner	Object	<p>The Regulation 16 Submission Plan Policies Map shows the revised village confines boundary for Maidwell cutting through many of the gardens of houses on both sides of Draughton Road after it turns north at the school. Surely this line should be drawn at the existing boundary which is at the end of these gardens as shown on the original plan. Maidwell Hall School which has played a central part in the village history, is the main employer within the village and is clearly part of the village, has been entirely omitted.</p> <p>There is no provision for any growth within this village boundary. As with many villages there is a need for some smaller houses suitable for either young families or the elderly wishing to “downsize”. Both are important as either is likely to increase support for the primary school.</p> <p>I am broadly in agreement with the green line depicting the village confines on the original plan as shown in Fig 3. and trust you will agree to that proposal.</p>
MwD22 Mrs M Sanders-Hewett	Object	<p>I object strongly to some of the revisions to the confines as set out by our Neighbourhood Plan as follows:</p> <p>Maidwell Hall - the Hall and its adjacent grounds have been an integral part of the village for hundreds of years, in the past being one of the two manor houses in the village and providing employment and accommodation in the cottages it owned for many villagers. I strongly recommend that it should be within the confines of Maidwell.</p> <p>Hall Farm - the building has been an integral part of a working farm for many years; indeed the houses and their gardens in Blueberry Close were built on the site previously occupied by the barns and cowsheds in use by this farm and there was never any boundary between them.</p> <p>Gardens on east and west sides of Draughton Road - I do not understand the reasons for cutting off the ends of these gardens as Maidwell is a Restricted Infill village and surely any prospective Planning Applications would be turned down for that reason.</p>

		<p>The general consensus in the original consultation document was that Maidwell should be allowed to grow slowly, organically and with small developments. The danger of the confines as drawn by yourselves is that the village will atrophy. As you will note from previous Housing Surveys, smaller properties will ensure the future of the village, bringing in younger families.</p>
MwD23 Mrs K Sharrock	Object	<p>The following statement on page 27 is incorrect:</p> <p>“Maidwell is bisected by the A508 and that to try and reduce traffic speed further would be both unrealistic and unreasonable.”</p> <p>The speed limit is 30mph on the A508 and if traffic stuck to the speed limit this would be acceptable, however, the majority of traffic exceeds 30mph with vehicles regularly doing 50-60mph. The speed doesn't need to be less than 30mph but traffic calming within the village is needed. Many young children live on the Harborough Road and it's only a matter of time before there is an accident. The proposal for 5 houses next to Maidwell Hall School are likely be sold to families. The statement needs to be put into context to recognise actual speeds.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is meant to ensure safe pathways for pedestrians and cyclists. If cars stuck to 30mph this would be ok but because they don't, it is very difficult to cross the A508 as there is no path on our side of the road. It's not especially safe walking along the path on the other side in such close proximity to speeding traffic especially as some of the traffic are lorries. I'm not able to take my child and dog out for a walk on my own during the week because it's too hard to cross the road and too dangerous to have them both on the narrow footpath. This is very poor living standards and should be addressed given the number of families on the road with young children.</p>
MwD24 Mr & Mrs Nuvoloni	Support	<p>I support the proposed amended confines of the village of Maidwell as I feel it reflects the nature of village located as it is in open countryside whilst also allowing for organic growth and development of the village through development within the village in keeping with its character and history.</p>
MwD25 Savills on behalf of Merton College, Oxford	Comment	<p>Welcomes the plan's keenness to provide guidance for windfall development. Growth targets for the two villages should be regarded as a minimum to enable it to respond to changing housing requirements over the plan period.</p>
	Comment	<p>MD4 – consider that basic conditions b) and c) are satisfied in relation to listed buildings and conservation areas.</p>
	Comment	<p>MF5 – consider that basic condition d) is met in terms of contributing to sustainable development.</p>
	Comment	<p>Considers that the general policies of the plan uphold the strategic policies in the emerging</p>

		local plan and supports the assessment that the plan has been prepared in conformity with the development plan (basic condition e).
	Comment	Satisfied that basic condition f) has been complied with regarding conformity with EU obligations.
	Comment	MD1 – supportive of village confines to provide clarity to where presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply. They should not be drawn too tightly to allow sufficient room for growth over the plan period. Consider that they are drawn too tightly.
	Comment	<p>MD5 – supports thrust of the policy, however the growth targets for the two villages should be regarded as a minimum. Policy relates closely to the confines, which are drawn too tightly to allow for the target growth. Land at Draughton Road, Maidwell and land off Maidwell Road, Draughton has previously been identified as having the potential to accommodate an appropriate level of growth in the plan area. Maps included in submission.</p> <p>Land north of Draughton Road, Maidwell – site is well related to existing built form and could assist in delivering the plan’s aims and aspirations. Modest residential development could enable a car park and safe walking route to ease congestion, a community orchard and open space.</p> <p>Land off Maidwell Road, Draughton/land at Lamport Road, Draughton - site could assist in delivering the plan’s aspirations. Note lack of confines for Draughton.</p>
MwD26 Mrs A Paybody	Object	<p>Object to the purple boundary line which excludes Maidwell Hall and Manor Farm and yard. These properties are part of the original settlement of the village and should definitely be included in any map/plan of Maidwell village. Elm Cottages and Paines Close are also part of the village and I'm sure the residents of these properties feel they live in Maidwell. How can a plan/map of the village cut gardens in half, as the proposed purple line does to the gardens of property on the west/east of Draughton Road?</p> <p>I do not consider Maidwell to be an 'Other Village' as we have a public house (offering bed & breakfast and restaurant), garage, two schools, Church, village hall, a private bed & breakfast facility, and an hourly bus service to Leicester/Milton Keynes, via Market Harborough/Northampton. The Macmillan Way goes right through the village and the Brampton Valley Way is within 10 minutes walk.</p> <p>I feel that Maidwell is in need of some small scale development and infill to prevent the village stagnating. There is a requirement for smaller housing to encourage younger families to the village to grow our local rural community.</p>
MwD27 Wildlife Trust	Comment	The NDP needs to include the following points; ecological issues, wildlife / biodiversity matters,

		<p>the 9 Principles of Green Infrastructure (GI), natural environmental aspects / assets, connectivity of wildlife habitats, adaptation to climate change effects, biodiversity enhancements, and national / local policy guidance that recommends a nett planning gain in favour of biodiversity.</p> <p>There should be more detail and also a more complete picture of the existing situation regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing natural assets in the neighbourhood plan area (maps enclosed). For instance, please be aware that there is priority Ancient Woodland Habitat areas within the existing, designated Scotland Wood and Short Wood (Daventry) Local Wildlife Site (LWS) • Biodiversity / Ecological / Geological matters • The “Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document for Northamptonshire”, August 2015; • Northamptonshire county Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) target delivery • Green Infrastructure (GI) network provision delivery • Adaptations to climate change (especially to favour habitats and species) • Natural England’s ANGST guidelines (in respect of Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards) • The River Nene Regional Park’s (RNRP’s) "Northamptonshire's Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character Assessment" toolkit.
	Comment	References to the NPPF should be updated to the current revised version. In biodiversity terms the most important and significant reference which needs to be extracted from the 2018 NPPF is para 170, part d) regarding minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.
	Comment	The Objectives should include retention, protection, enhancement, future delivery and appropriate management of biodiversity and GI. This should be reflected in policies MD2 and MD3.
	Comment	MD3a, MD3b and other references to LGS and important open space - recommend the use of Natural England’s ANGST guidelines in respect of Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards.
	Comment	MD8 – consideration should be given to enrolling St. Mary the Virgin Church in Maidwell and St. Catherine’s Church in Draughton into the “Northamptonshire Nature Conservation Churchyard Scheme” and taking part in the annual competition.
	Comment	MD3c – factual errors in references to the LWS areas since the whole of the ‘north / south’ route of the Brampton Valley Way corridor, running through the neighbourhood area is already designated as a set of contiguous LWS areas.
	Comment	The proposed neighbourhood area is located at a significant strategic position, straddling an existing ‘N / S-trending’ major, strategic, Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure (GI) Corridor

		<p>route; which also includes a 'parallel', separate, Disused Railway Line GI Corridor route. There is also a 'lobe / arm' of the much larger Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area (NIA) zone which overlaps with a portion of the southern area of the Maidwell Parish hal' of the neighbourhood area.</p>
	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Reference provided for Northamptonshire Local Records Centre.</p>
<p>MwD28 Mr C Abolins</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The original proposal regarding the Village Confines in Maidwell was supported by the majority of respondents, as was the need for 'modest growth' over the 10 year plan period. Subsequently DDC in its response to Reg 14 Consultation suggested a much tighter interpretation of village confines guidance. A 'compromise' was sought by the steering group as set out in para 4.1.5, p16. Proposed Reg 16 Confines Boundary. This revised proposal goes against the views of the majority of respondents and significantly restricts the ability for modest sustainable growth to take place in the village over the 10 year period of the Plan.</p> <p>It appears that in its response DDC have proposed arbitrary boundaries through existing gardens that have historically always been recognised as within the village confines and clearly not part of the open countryside beyond. This is particularly noticeable on the east of the Harborough Road and on the west side of Draughton Road where in the case of New Lodge for example a building in the garden, which has been in existence for some 30 years and is in daily use, now falls outside the village confines.</p> <p>The steering group in its 'informal ' discussions with DDC have considered that further consultation on the Village Confines boundary is not deemed necessary. I'm not sure why this view has been taken as I believe that with such significant changes proposed on such an important matter, further consultation was and is necessary to ensure future sustainability of the villages.</p> <p>I do not believe that the current proposal on Village confines meets the Basic Conditions in that it does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The issue of Village Confines boundaries needs to be revisited and revised to ensure that there will be sufficient modest development potential for the next 10 years.</p>