



**West  
Northamptonshire  
Council**

## **Overstone 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 Overstone Neighbourhood Development Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Overstone Neighbourhood Development 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 WNC website at:

[West Northamptonshire Council Daventry Area Submitted Neighbourhood Plans](#)

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

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
ONP01 Historic England	Comment	<p>Re-submission of Regulation 14 comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood area contains a number of important designated heritage assets, the strategy should safeguard elements which contribute to significance</li> <li>• Advises seeking advice from LPA and Historic Environment Record</li> <li>• Historic England advice notes have been produced to assist communities operating at a neighbourhood level</li> </ul>
ONP02 Sport England Central	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NP should reflect and comply with NPPF, particularly paras 96-97</li> <li>• Reference and links to Sport England policy and guidance for sport and playing fields, needs assessment, design of new facilities and Active Design.</li> <li>• An existing LPA produced playing pitch or indoor/outdoor facility strategy would be useful evidence and the NP should reflect relevant neighbourhood area recommendations and actions. Where this does not exist, NP policies and investment opportunities should be based on a proportionate assessment of need for local sporting provision and involve the local sporting and wider community.</li> <li>• New housing generates demand for sport, policies should secure new or improvements if existing facilities do not have the capacity. Proposed actions should accord with approved local or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, priorities identified in needs assessments and sports pitch or facility strategy.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to how new development, especially housing, provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles and communities. Reference Active Design.</li> </ul>
ONP03 MJ Tidd	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan talks about protecting rural nature and environment but lacks consistency around the Green Wedge.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies Map Central shows LWS1 and LGS3 (Spinney areas) as non-designated heritage assets, however, downstream part of Cowpasture Spinney is a designated heritage asset. All of Cowpasture Spinney should be a designated heritage asset. Trees and streams provide a natural visual screen for Sywell Road residents.</li> <li>• Screen at northern boundary of Green Wedge visually separates residents from construction site and will benefit the new residents.</li> </ul>
ONP04 Sport England South	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NP should reflect and comply with NPPF, particularly paras 96-97</li> <li>• Reference and links to Sport England policy and guidance for sport and playing fields, needs assessment, design of new facilities and Active Design.</li> <li>• An existing LPA produced playing pitch or indoor/outdoor facility strategy would be useful evidence and the NP should reflect relevant neighbourhood area recommendations and actions. Where this does not exist, NP policies and investment opportunities should be based on a proportionate assessment of need for local sporting provision and involve the local sporting and wider community.</li> <li>• New housing generates demand for sport, policies should secure new or improvements if existing facilities do not have the capacity. Proposed actions should accord with approved local or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, priorities identified in needs assessments and sports pitch or facility strategy.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to how new development, especially housing, provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles and communities. Reference Active Design.</li> </ul>
ONP05 Anglian Water	Support  Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2: All new development should meet the highest standards of sustainable design including best practice for sustainable drainage systems and maximising water efficiency. Support requirement for provision of SuDS and proposals having to maximise water efficiency.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5: Previously sought changes to this policy so that it refers to infrastructure provision as an exceptional use which is acceptable in principle outside the confines. Modification appears not to have been made despite Consultation Statement agreeing to it. Suggested amended wording of point 2 is provided.</li> <li>• Policy 11: Welcomes reference to development proposals providing biodiversity net gain</li> </ul>
ONP06 A & H Kingsbury	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks those involved in the project and fully support the plan.</li> </ul>
ONP07 A & C Duncan	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to proposed Local Open Space on private land within Overstone Park and privately owned road from Sywell Road to the Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No right of way through private land of Overstone Park or privately farm track from Sywell Road.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park is privately and jointly owned by Park residents.</li> <li>○ No formal permission or easement has ever been granted to Park land, except Council and emergency vehicles and those with legitimate purpose.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park Management Committee protects access and privacy through clear signage, intermittent use of security guards, closing and locking gates and challenging unauthorised users.</li> <li>○ Overstone Manor gate was blocked in 2016 by purchasing contractors. Cannot be regarded as part of a historical loop because it has not existed for last 5 years</li> <li>○ Council previously recognised Park as private land by declining tree planting grants because they would not be seen by the public.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park residents have good relations with Overstone and Sywell Parish residents. Entrance is by invitation only, there is no automatic right of access.</li> <li>○ Owner of farm track from Sywell Road to Court Farm has never granted access except to official vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Support/Object / Comment</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
ONP08 C Bidwell	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to proposed Local Open Space on private land within Overstone Park and privately owned road from Sywell Road to the Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No right of way through private land of Overstone Park or privately farm track from Sywell Road.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park is privately and jointly owned by Park residents.</li> <li>○ No formal permission or easement has ever been granted to Park land, except Council and emergency vehicles and those with legitimate purpose.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park Management Committee protects access and privacy through clear signage, intermittent use of security guards, closing and locking gates and challenging unauthorised users.</li> <li>○ Overstone Manor gate was blocked in 2016 by purchasing contractors. Cannot be regarded as part of a historical loop because it has not existed for last 5 years</li> <li>○ Council previously recognised Park as private land by declining tree planting grants because they would not be seen by the public.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park residents have good relations with Overstone and Sywell Parish residents. Entrance is by invitation only, there is no automatic right of access.</li> <li>○ Owner of farm track from Sywell Road to Court Farm has never granted access except to official vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
ONP09 Mr & Mrs M Hanly	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to proposed Local Open Space on private land within Overstone Park and privately owned road from Sywell Road to the Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No right of way through private land of Overstone Park or privately farm track from Sywell Road.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park is privately and jointly owned by Park residents.</li> <li>○ No formal permission or easement has ever been granted to Park land, except Council and emergency vehicles and those with legitimate purpose.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overstone Park Management Committee protects access and privacy through clear signage, intermittent use of security guards, closing and locking gates and challenging unauthorised users.</li> <li>○ Overstone Manor gate was blocked in 2016 by purchasing contractors. Cannot be regarded as part of a historical loop because it has not existed for last 5 years</li> <li>○ Council previously recognised Park as private land by declining tree planting grants because they would not be seen by the public.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park residents have good relations with Overstone and Sywell Parish residents. Entrance is by invitation only, there is no automatic right of access.</li> <li>○ Owner of farm track from Sywell Road to Court Farm has never granted access except to official vehicles.</li> </ul>
ONP10 S & L Reece-Raybould	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Object to proposed Local Open Space on private land within Overstone Park and privately owned road from Sywell Road to the Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No right of way through private land of Overstone Park or privately farm track from Sywell Road.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park is privately and jointly owned by Park residents.</li> <li>○ No formal permission or easement has ever been granted to Park land, except Council and emergency vehicles and those with legitimate purpose.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park Management Committee protects access and privacy through clear signage, intermittent use of security guards, closing and locking gates and challenging unauthorised users.</li> <li>○ Overstone Manor gate was blocked in 2016 by purchasing contractors. Cannot be regarded as part of a historical loop because it has not existed for last 5 years</li> <li>○ Council previously recognised Park as private land by declining tree planting grants because they would not be seen by the public.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Support/Object / Comment</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overstone Park residents have good relations with Overstone and Sywell Parish residents. Entrance is by invitation only, there is no automatic right of access.</li> <li>○ Owner of farm track from Sywell Road to Court Farm has never granted access except to official vehicles.</li> </ul>
ONP11 C McGann	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to proposed Local Open Space on private land within Overstone Park and privately owned road from Sywell Road to the Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No right of way through private land of Overstone Park or privately farm track from Sywell Road.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park is privately and jointly owned by Park residents.</li> <li>○ No formal permission or easement has ever been granted to Park land, except Council and emergency vehicles and those with legitimate purpose.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park Management Committee protects access and privacy through clear signage, intermittent use of security guards, closing and locking gates and challenging unauthorised users.</li> <li>○ Overstone Manor gate was blocked in 2016 by purchasing contractors. Cannot be regarded as part of a historical loop because it has not existed for last 5 years</li> <li>○ Council previously recognised Park as private land by declining tree planting grants because they would not be seen by the public.</li> <li>○ Overstone Park residents have good relations with Overstone and Sywell Parish residents. Entrance is by invitation only, there is no automatic right of access.</li> <li>○ Owner of farm track from Sywell Road to Court Farm has never granted access except to official vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
ONP12 N & S Brunton-Reed	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the proposed Local Open Spaces on private land within Overstone Park and privately owned road from Sywell Road to the Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No right of way up privately owned farm track from Sywell Road past Court Farm to Overstone Park.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultation Statement states that all residents and businesses in the parish, statutory bodies and consultees were consulted. Objectors are named in the document. This is untrue and nor were they consulted as owners of Court Farm.</li> </ul>
ONP13 P Davies	Comment Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge attention to detail and considerable work involved in plan's production.</li> <li>• Description of Overstone as a village approx. 5 miles NE of Northampton is misleading. It should acknowledge that it is at the NE edge of the Northampton conurbation.</li> <li>• Clarify required in references to "village" and "parish" in the aims and objectives.</li> <li>• Misses the opportunity to explore and promote integration of entire parish to include the SUE. Would be preferable to explore ways of retaining the character of the old village whilst integrating new development. Significant growth will change the nature of the parish and plan could explore how land between the village and SUE could be developed to benefit everyone and how the parish can retain a separate identity to Northampton.</li> </ul>
ONP14 Councillor D Cribbin & Councillor M Warren	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Moulton Parish Council's consultation response.</li> <li>• NP does not address the needs of the SUE and appears to actively exclude the SUE from any involvement with the existing village or Overstone Parish Council in the future.</li> <li>• NP does not seem to make provision for community support or infrastructure for new residents.</li> <li>• SUE includes provision for a community building but it is possible that it will not be delivered (see what happened at Buckton Fields with the park and ride and care home).</li> <li>• Apparent detachment from SUE is impacting on service provision at the SUE where residents are looking to Moulton/Moulton PC rather than Overstone PC.</li> </ul>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Support/Object / Comment</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPC will be able to access higher level of CIL when plan is adopted, some of which needs to be spent on service provision for new and existing residents.</li> </ul>
ONP15 P Murphy	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to inclusion of Overstone Park "Track to Court Farm and Overstone Park" in the plan.</li> </ul>
ONP16 M McGuire	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property boundaries are incorrectly shown on page 32. This has been discussed and agreed at Parish Council level (reference minutes of Extraordinary meeting of OPC 12 October 2020). Request that this is amended.</li> </ul>
ONP17 Natural England	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific comments.</li> </ul>
ONP18 Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Grid confirms that there are no assets, including high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, within the neighbourhood plan area.</li> <li>• Weblinks provided to information in respect of NG assets and guidance close to gas and electricity infrastructure</li> </ul>
ONP19 Mr A Rooney on behalf of Overstone Park Management Ltd.	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As MD of OPML and Chair of the Park Residents Association strongly objects to plans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Roadways and verges owned by shareholders of OPML.</li> <li>○ Roadways and verges are totally private, with clear signage at main entrance and farm gate. Maintained and repaired by shareholders since 1980.</li> <li>○ Park is central to the area covered by the plan, no residents were notified or contacted.</li> <li>○ Question under privacy laws why private properties are named as heritage assets without permission or consultation with owners.</li> <li>○ School within the Park is a Special Needs school with a unique relationship with residents. Question whether the plan has considered impact of allowing public access on the children.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
ONP20 Howkins & Harrison on behalf of Mr Bletsoe-Brown	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reiterates comments to Regulation 14 consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy 5: defining confines tightly is inappropriate, restrictive and stifles further development. SCLP defines Overstone as an Other Village, does not define a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<p>settlement boundary, instead using a criteria based approach. NP should use Council's criteria. NP's approach undermines SCLP policy RA3 and is contrary to NPPF para 29, removing flexibility to cater for future needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy 6: restricting development to infill or redevelopment is too restrictive and contradicts policy 5. Policy 5's tight definition of confines restricts site availability and stifles development, contrary to the purpose of NPs which should set out a positive vision. Client supports policy 3 which supports new facilities and expects new development to contribute. Tightly drawn confines will stifle development which will limit CIL/S106. A more positive approach to new development including beyond the confines is needed. Policy should be amended to allow development beyond the confines where it can deliver or contribute towards infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Policy 7: identifies a need for affordable housing in the village at 40% on 5 or more dwellings (Council threshold). Tight confines and requirement for infill/redevelopment mean that there will be no plots sufficiently large to accommodate developments of more than 5 dwellings. Policy 6 should be amended to reflect need for facilities and affordable housing; development beyond confines should be allowed where it can be delivered.</li> </ul>
ONP21 West Northamptonshire Council (formerly Daventry District Council)	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan should acknowledgement the positive role of the SUE, including provision of accessible services and facilities, thus contributing towards a sustainable wider community. Clarification provided regarding name of SUE, level of affordable housing on Overstone Leys, Overstone Green outline application and NRDA affordable housing level.</li> <li>• Plan should not attribute greater importance to some listed buildings over others when they are the same grade; suggested wording provided. Reference to Overstone Park should acknowledge that it still retains much historic character.</li> <li>• Clarification requested as to whether reference to community services and facilities in key issues covers new and existing.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2: should aspire to enhance and create new GI as well as retaining it; suggested working provided.</li> <li>• Policy 3: clarification required on difference between CIL and S106, objective of the latter being to mitigate impact not ensure sustainability.</li> <li>• Policy 4: improving community services is a key issue but does not translate to policy; policy 3 or 4 could be adapted to support new local services and facilities.</li> <li>• Policy 5: should refer to policies map and SCLP policy RA6.</li> <li>• Policy 6: recommend change to make it consistent with NPPF and SCLP.</li> <li>• Policy 7: policy could deal with local housing need in light of updated housing needs survey, which should be referenced.</li> <li>• Policy 8: acknowledge new accessible green spaces that will be created on the SUE. Clarification on difference between local open space and local green space. Two identified local green spaces would be better identified as views only as they are tracks.</li> <li>• Policy 9: views should be shown on figure 8 and policies maps. Suggested wording provided to enhance clarity of supporting text.</li> <li>• Policy 10: suggested wording provided to enhance clarity of supporting text. Non-designated heritage assets should be listed in supporting text with link to evidence base. Need for greater clarity on criteria used to select non-designated heritage assets.</li> <li>• Policy 11: suggested change to clarify that local and potential wildlife sites were designated outside the neighbourhood plan process.</li> <li>• Policy 12: supporting text should acknowledge employment opportunities at SUE.</li> </ul>
ONP22 Pegasus on behalf of L&Q Estates & Davidsons Developments	Support Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support principle of section 4.2.1 and welcome update in response to previous comment</li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note update to Fig 3 showing extent of the Northampton North SUE, however, Policies Map does not identify it. Suggest an amendment to provide clarity because it could be perceived as open countryside.</li> </ul>
<p>ONP23 West Northamptonshire Council Key Services (formerly Northamptonshire County Council)</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Responding on behalf of Education, Libraries, Broadband and Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue. Comments based on County Council’s adopted Planning Obligations Framework and Guidance “Creating Sustainable Communities Jan 2015”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Plan does not make any additional residential allocations within the village boundary although it acknowledges that the village may need to accommodate a limited degree amount of growth.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New housing in plan period may place additional pressure on school places. Developer contributions (S106 &amp; CIL) may be required for new, enhanced or improved infrastructure to mitigate impact and support long term sustainability. This may include planning obligations towards local education infrastructure to ensure sufficient capacity to accommodate all sources of pupil growth.</li> <li>○ In some circumstances it may be necessary for the Council to forward fund key infrastructure before development. Where demonstrated that future development will benefit from early delivery developer, contributions will be required retrospectively.</li> <li>○ Council will work with relevant school, Education Skills and Funding Agency and other partners to ensure suitable provision is available and will secure contributions where appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fire and Rescue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New developments and associated infrastructure results in increased population and traffic movements, leading to increased community risk and additional demands on the service. Projected growth will impact on Service’s ability to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<p>maintain Standards of Operational Response in terms of community risk from fire and road traffic collisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A number of service needs. Where there is a direct impact on infrastructure provision from new housing development, contributions towards service buildings and equipment will be required through S106 obligations.</li> <li>○ Council will work with developers, LPA and Fire and Rescue to respond to site specific requirements to identify opportunities for improvements to meet demand.</li> <li>● Libraries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Contributions required for new, extended or improved library facilities where new major development generates additional need</li> <li>○ National Library Tariff includes a minimum space standard/1000 population and a sqm cost for public libraries</li> <li>○ Where there is a direct impact on infrastructure from new housing development, contributions towards facilities, services, buildings and equipment will be required through S106.</li> <li>○ Council will work with developers, LPA and Library Service to respond to site specific requirements to identify opportunities for improvements to meet demand.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Broadband: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Target of 40% full fibre broadband connectivity by December 2023. Essential that all new developments are served by high quality full fibre high speed networks.</li> <li>○ Measures must be introduced early to enable commercial communications market to deploy to new build areas. Links provided to supplier websites.</li> <li>○ Ducting works should be compliant with specific manuals and construction details.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Other infrastructure:</li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advise liaising directly with other departments, including Highways, for additional requirements.</li> </ul>
ONP24 Mr R Smith	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of engagement with Overstone Park residents and business owners during preparation.</li> <li>• Objects to LOS2 and V6, which should be removed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of consultation/notification about proposal to designate land within the Park as a Local Open Space. Should have followed government policy used for local green space designation by contacting owners at the earliest stage.</li> <li>○ Para 4.6.5 states that LGS and Open Space with public access are important. The Farm Track (named as Track to Court Farm and Overstone Park) and associated land/ buildings are privately owned and do not have public access, thus failing the plan's own criteria.</li> <li>○ Designation of LGS, local open space and sensitive views may be possible where either public ownership or access does not exist, but not both. Here, neither the place or view are publicly available.</li> <li>○ LOS2 and V6 appear to be proposed in the hope that the place and view will be important in the future, which is inappropriate. Designation should apply to what is important now not what plan might like to be important.</li> <li>○ LOS2 is a farm track, not a Local Open Space nor is it open.</li> <li>○ Business requirements involve daily use of heavy machinery on the track and land, which would be incompatible with public access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NP should encourage successful business performance within the area. Policy 12 improves amenity, jobs and business prosperity and fails in this regard.</li> </ul>
ONP25 Moulton Parish Council	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clarity about community infrastructure and facilities, including where and when it will be delivered and how developer contributions will be used.</li> <li>• OPC cannot assume that all CIL funding from SUE will be available, some has already been committed.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Support/Object / Comment	Summary of response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clarity on whether developer contributions for education and leisure will be directed to Overstone or adjoining parishes. Education, waste and highways are statutory services provided by higher level administrations.</li> <li>• Plan seems to rely on neighbouring parishes to provide many facilities to support new development.</li> <li>• Lack of acknowledgement of the SUE and the facilities it will provide throughout the plan, no attempt to integrate it and future residents with existing village.</li> <li>• Lack of clarity over how public transport will be provided and what influence OPC has over this.</li> <li>• Policy 4: unsure how the NP can protect and improve facilities that the parish council has no control over - primary school, church or post office/stores and village hall. Policy does not encourage SUE residents to support the facilities to ensure they remain sustainable and ignores new facilities on the SUE.</li> <li>• Policy 5: new guidance needed on where any future development will be permitted. "No development" includes recreational facilities.</li> <li>• Policy 8: LOS 1, cannot assume owner of Overstone Hall will allow future access. LOS 2 is described as accessible but the entrance to the track is signed as private. Questions whether Ass Bank can be designated as a LGS as it is privately owned and it isn't clear where public access is allowed. Playing fields are only accessible outside school times.</li> <li>• Policy 9: all the views are of fields suggesting that no development is possible.</li> <li>• Policy 12: does not say where new small scale business would be supported.</li> </ul>