

ROECLIFFE AND WESTWICK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN: PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) FEEDBACK ASSESSMENT

RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS

Comments	Agree, disagree, don't know (Y, N, D/K)	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
Vision			
Little community spirit, few visitors. Needs to encourage new families and not oppose diversity or innovation.	Y – 29 N – 2 D/K - 1	A good point – Vision could be amended to reflect the spirit of this comment.	Amend vision so that it welcomes new people and new ideas.
Does not contribute to sustainable development due to restrictive policies.		Disagree – the Plan is in line with SD when taken in its entirety and in its geographical context.	None
Create new footpaths		Project – noted.	None
Improve footpaths		Project – noted.	None
Green space is a broad term and needs clarifying in vision otherwise might contradict later statements.		Leave broad in the vision and be more specific in policies.	None
Address fly tipping		Project - noted.	None
Objectives			
Ob1. Confused about term 'built setting' (x2)	Y -30 N – 1 D/K - 2	Could be clearer -built environment/built up area?	Amend Objective1 – 'built environment'
Ob2. New homes should be to the benefit of all not just residents. Existing AND future residents. Address affordable homes.	Y – 31 N – 0 D/K - 1	Agreed – noted. Agreed – noted. No – covered by Local Plan.	Amend Objective2 accordingly. Amend Objective2 accordingly. No change.
Ob3.	Y – 31 N – 1 D/K - 0	-	-
Ob4. Tighter definition of green space – local/valuable?	Y – 32 N – 2 D/K - 0	No – Definition is purposefully broad here.	No change
Ob5. Roelcliffe park extension into green corridor is contrary to this objective.	Y – 1 N – 3 D/K - 0	Cannot deal with previous decisions/developments.	No change.

Comments	Agree, disagree, don't know (Y, N, D/K)	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
Ob6.	Y – 30 N – 3 D/K - 0	-	-
Ob7.	Y – 34 N – 0 D/K -0	-	-
Ob8.	Y – 33 N – 0 D/K -1	-	-
Ob9. Need footpath on the church side of the green. Avoid intrusive signage/calming. Address volume of parental traffic around school.	Y – 30 N – 2 D/K -2	Project – noted. Noted. Noted – highways issue.	No changes
Policy A1 – design and development			
Too prescriptive, stifling innovation. Change can be positive, environmentally positive. Too traditional.	Y – 30 N – 3 D/K - 0	Agree – find possibilities for innovation in design.	Consultant to propose new words.
Doesn't take account of future changes, trends, improvements in materials		Doesn't prejudice against this.	No change
'maintaining space and proportion' should be better defined eg 'in keeping with historic and present style of village'.		Agree – useful addition	Amend as proposed bullet 3.
Policy A2 – design of extensions			
Highly prescriptive and limiting and discourages affordable builds.	Y – 33 N – 1 D/K – 0	Disagree – doesn't affect affordable housing.	No change
Policy A3 – community involvement			
Access and disturbance should be taken into account too.	Y – 30 N – 1 D/K – 2	Agree – useful to add to bullet 4.	Amend Bullet 4 to account for 'residential amenity'
Policy A4 – key views			
Views 2 and 4 are the same and could be merged. X2	Y – 29	Noted	Group to consider amendment/merger.

Comments	Agree, disagree, don't know (Y, N, D/K)	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
Views identified restrict sustainable development	N – 1 D/K - 2	Disagree – policy enables SD	No change
Policy B1 – small scale housing development			
Where is low cost affordable housing being encouraged?	Y – 24 N – 6 D/K - 2	Covered by HBC local plan	No change
Restricts sustainable development		Disagree – enables development to be sustainable	No change
5 or less unless affordable included,		Justified by national guidance	No change
10 is large scale for roedcliffe		Justified by national guidance	No change
'considered' would be a better word x2		No – this enables SD	No change
Does this include park bungalows?		Potentially yes	No change
Policy B2 – development criteria highways			
Additional 'grass-creting' on village green.	Y – 32 N – 0 D/K - 2	Project - noted	No change
Make a one way system around the green.		Highways project - noted	No change
Traffic calming at village entrances		Project - noted	No change
No yellow lines or traffic bumps		Highways - noted	No change
Policy B3 – adequate car parking provision			
Needs a local landowner to release some land.	Y – 34 N – 0	No – applies to new development	No change
Parking issues associated with the school need a long term solution x2	D/K - 0	Noted – potential project	No change
Policy C1 – maintaining village facilities and services			
No community meeting place x2	Y – 33 N – 1 D/K - 0	Noted	No change
Pub closed.		Noted – potential PC project regarding assets of community value	No change
A reasonable length of time must pass before any change of use is pursued.		As above	No change
Policy C2 – non designated local heritage assets			
Include Vicarage Farm – grade II x2	Y – 32 N – 2 D/K - 0	No – listed buildings not included as already protected.	No change
As long as tax payer funds are not spent on private residences		Noted – no intention	No change
I don't agree with the inclusion of individual residences – there are many other residences of note. Should be all or none. X2		Noted – those specified identified through consultation and research. Conservation Area policy applies to rest.	No change

Comments	Agree, disagree, don't know (Y, N, D/K)	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
Policy D1 – footpaths, cycleways and bridleways			
As a landowner with a footpath across our field I would only be happy if this happened after consultation and did not impact local residents.	Y – 29 N – 4 D/K - 0	Noted	Amend to include residential amenity
New RoW will create improved access for criminals and rural crime.		Noted – but disagree	No change
Policy E1 – Local Green Space			
This should be called out more earlier in the plan and more clearly in the vision.	Y – 33 N – 0 D/K - 0	Noted – but Objective is broad to include other types of green space covered by policies.	No change
Protect village green in all circumstances		LGS designation is in line with Green Belt policy.	No change
Policy E2 – green infrastructure			
Map is not clear where they are.		Map in plan	No change
Tree felling replace with native species.		Agreed	Amend bullet 3
The farmland south of Becklands Lane and Bar Lane is not named yet seems at risk from development. Can you define this area?	Y – 32 N – 2 D/K - 0	Needs to be a clear part of a corridor which this is not – cant just designate new 'green belt'.	No change
Some proposed corridors are on private land without public access.		Noted – access not an issue	No change
Policy F1 – local business support			
Difficult to see where new business can locate if we keep a green corridor open.	Y – 32 N – 0 D/K - 2	Potential for business development in many locations other than Bar Lane	No change
Policy F2 – broadband connectivity			
No more than 9mbps at present.		Noted	No change
Exceptions for more rural locations where fibre cost could be prohibitive. (x2)	Y – 34 N – 0 D/K - 0	Noted	Possible to define 'fibre ready'? Consultant to advise.
Could be more specific about how the village can be fibre to the premises ready.		Noted	As above
Policy F3 – Bar Lane Industrial Zone			
Light and noise pollution from local industry operating 24/7. Needs to be of concern for future business activity.	Y – 34 N – 0 D/K - 0	Agreed - a useful addition	Amend policy as proposed to account for residential amenity.