

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
		voted to keep											
10	1	I agree with the current draft plan and the sites suggested.	1		1		1						
10	2	I believe small small developments are the way forward							1				1
10	3	I think the provision of car parking is an excellent idea and very much needed									1		
11	1	I do not agree with the Braunston Lane proposal as this would significantly increase road traffic past a very busy school and much used playing field. Also it would close in the already open view of the area and cannot be classified as an infill project as the nearest buildings are some distance away on the side of the proposed development						1					
12	1	Thank you for the consultation event yesterday. It made it even clearer that in order to protect our village as much as possible we need both houses and allocated sites.	1						1				
12	2	My preferred site is next to the school and all 15 houses on the same site			1								
12	3	My concerns about Braunston Lane site is the extra traffic along Braunston Lane, this is already basically a one way road with only half the road usable. People do not keep to speed signs and this road passes/includes the village playing field.						1					
12	4	I also agree with community benefit of a car park and further discussion with the school to ease the flow of traffic in Glebe Lane. This would also benefit the village if it were next to the school.									1		

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
12	5	Thank you to all who helped with the proceedings, the consultants definitely improved understanding of the process											1
13	1	The village should allow for more dwellings to be built No more than ten to fifteen							1				
13	2	I think the site should be on the Daventry Road next to the Windmill Gardens Also consider what type of houses are being built	1										
13	3	I do disagree on the Braunston Lane site (20) too much traffic going into the one area						1					
13	4	Site (2) next to the school there should be more houses built not just 10 it should be a lot more			1								1
14	1	Over the coming years we do need to have more houses built. At the moment I do not agree with the two sites that you want to build on site (20) end of Braunston Lane too much traffic now with the parents parking and reversing in the residents drives. I understand you wanted to stop parents arriving into the school by opening this site you will be doing the reverse		1		1		1	1				
14	2	Plot next to the school 8 acres is a large site if you allow houses to be built then it will not stop there, more will be built. Will we end up like Sixfield and spoil the look of the village. Again too many cars going through the village											1
14	3	What about our bus route?											1
15	1	There is a need for more houses in every part of the country and Staverton in the long run is no exception. Various developments have fitted in quite well and limited further							1				

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
18	1	Affordable Housing - this is pure mythology, a euphuism and an excuse for Housing Associations to hike their portfolio and thereby their profits. We all know that after the first sale anyway the house will revert to market value, and should that value go down, the carrions are unlikely to venture their capital a further time. I also challenge the belief that anybody has an entitlement to what amounts to subsidy by the rest of the community because by an accident of birth they feel they have the right to live here. many of us would like to return to our place of birth, but I somehow doubt that we would receive any priority on the housing list of that community!											2
18	2	Site Allocation - How ridiculous to put up sign posts to would-be developers to tell them where they can build! there should be a no site policy which states categorically that this village is not for development except for those who present their case to the PC and have it accepted individually and on merit. That has been past practice and in view of the fact that this was agreed during the transition to a conservation area, I see no reason to change this procedure, the arguments presented about the DDC, reaction were in my view speculative if not experience. Any objections from that quarter is something on this deal with this when it happens, but my experience was always that the DDC gave great weight to the desires of the village community ,and would compromise where it was necessary		2		2		2		2		2	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
18	4	<p>Finally, may I make a more general point here. We all know that since local councils divested themselves of housing stock there has been a great shortage of houses for both working class and young people. To fill this gap the free market has realised that immense profits are available for every square foot of land that can be acquired just the sharks and predators have gathered to capitalise on this situation. I is not for us to help them, especially at The expense of country communities who have long ago chosen a Rural existence, that could easily be transformed into the urban nightmares we all abhor. Ask anyone why they have come to live in the village, and it should be no surprise that they declared that they have long wished to shuffle of pressures of urban life. For that reason we should oppose the vehemently the inclination of those who feel this plan to be a mere adjustment it is in fact the thin end of the wedge and I would call upon the Parish Council to stop playing lip service to the plausible puppets of the powerful who's one concern is to enrich themselves of others/us</p>											2
19	1	<p>I do agree that new acceptable housing is very important following the consultation for Staverton neighbourhood development plan it was obvious that the village had not been kept fully informed as progress of proposed sites</p>							1				

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
23	1	I would just like to say that I would be in support of the development planned on the grounds next to the school and if extra parking could be provided as part of the package, so much the better.	1		1				1		1		
24	1	We understand that at this time it is not necessary to nominate particular sites for proposed development so would prefer to wait until it becomes necessary. Many changes could take place over a short period which are better addressed when the need arises. Also, the term 'affordable housing' needs clarification. What criteria is required?		2		2		2		2		2	
25	2	I am in favour of what the parish council has proposed. 5 houses in Braunston Lane and approx. 10 more on the site next to the school.	1		1		1		1		1		
26	1	Having heard all the evidence and arguments at the meeting on November 18 th , I submit the following statement: I am not against any suitable properties being built in Staverton in the future but I do not want any sites to be included in the neighbourhood plan. Thank you for all the hard work that has been put into the neighbourhood plan.		1		1		1	1			1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
33	2	Firstly, why as a village were we not asked if a No Site proposal was what we wanted? At no time has this option been talked about discussed, surely when, as application came through each would be looked at and decided on merit what would be the best for us.											1
33	3	It seems very strange that a large company like Avant would be interested in such a small site! 11 houses on an 8-acre site does not mean in the future they would be back to add more! Giving us a car park for 20 cars, well it needs to be double that, that's if you can get people to use it! When it rains now they only think of where to park what is nearest to the school or the village hall! At the moment the parking is a problem and yes I no that you cannot force people to do things they don't want to do. The entrance to the school site is along Daventry Road were at the moment some of the responsible parents do park to pick up their children, this will take away space for parking as I said they won't walk from a carpark that far away and certainly the village hall won't.									1		
33	4	The site at the end of Braunston Lane where we live well I must say the 2 gentlemen came across very well, it look as though they would be very sympathetic to the village and especially to the residents of Braunston Lane and Home Close.	1		1		1						

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
34	1	<p>Having attended the meeting in the village hall on Sat 18th Nov, I would like to raise a few points. Firstly, car parking 20 cars is not enough as there are at least 10 cars belonging to employees at the school and approx. another 30 at school start / finish. I don't think people from outside the village would use it especially during bad weather. The site at the school due to most parents parking along Daventry Road and Braunston Lane. A new housing estate would take some of the parking away. As Avant are proposing to build 11 houses on an 8-acre site next to the school, are they going to come back in the future to build more? What I've seen of these houses on other sites they are big and expensive and wouldn't attract young families which is what the village needs. We don't have bus service, village shop or Post Office and yet Daventry District Council are saying it has to expand. Do we really need to pick sites? Can we have a No Sites policy in the village remit? If so then the site locations could be discussed by the villagers and voted on. I'm not against more houses being built as long as they are in keeping with those in the village. We want young families to come to our village to put life back into it as the villagers as a whole aren't getting any younger. Our daughter would love to come back to the village but whenever a house comes on the market, it's usually out of their price range. Basically, affordable housing is needed and maybe a clause giving village children / offspring 1st refusal of these.</p>		1		1		1	1			1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
35	1	Both of us would definitely like for sites not to be included in the plan. The alternative of naming sites we feel is too restrictive and may be not the best option in the coming years. Better for a developer to follow normal channels when the need arises		2		2		2	2				
36	1	I would like to express my opinion that I do not think there should be any sites for building in our village please no sites		1		1		1		1		1	
37	1	I am against sites being included in a neighbourhood plan don't wish for further build being in village but believe in fill in where possible I chose to live in a village and enjoy community spirit I shame to spoil it		1		1		1		1		1	
38	1	I think the village plan should be submitted but no specific sites should be mentioned		1		1		1	1			1	
39	1	I do not want designated sites no sites is an option that should be adopted		1		1		1				1	
40	1	I do not want designated sites i.e. no site village plan policies should be governing any future building		1		1		1				1	
41	1	In response to your request for feedback, we fully support the principle and value of a Neighbourhood Development Plan and thank all those who have worked to get the plan to an advanced stage.											1
41	2	We do not however, support the selection of specified sites but favour clear, robust policies that respect that we are a conservation village and our existing status as a restricted infill village in a special landscape area.		2		2		2		2		1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
41	3	In particular, we fully endorse the arguments highlighted and set out in the attached leaflet.											1
41	4	We are concerned that the earlier consultations clearly advised that no development was not an option; a view we challenged at the time. Given the clear misrepresentation we have to question the validity of much of the feedback and would argue that new consultation should be carried out with the guidelines properly set out.											1
41	5	Furthermore, we are aghast that the basis for determining the number of new homes required is a simple survey of households in the parish. This is no more than opinion at a moment in time and should not serve as a sound basis for any planning policy!											1
42	1	We would prefer no site to be included in the upcoming Staverton neighbourhood development plan		2		2		2				2	
43	1	I am in agreement with the plan for 15 new dwellings in the parish i.e. smaller developments							1				
43	2	I do not agree that the sites should be designated at the present time		1		1		1				1	
44	1	I always said that Parish should've been consulted before the plan was put into operation											1
44	2	I feel there is no need for any formal sites in the village		1		1		1				1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
48	1	Firstly thank you for all your efforts with the Staverton development plan keeping this a smaller plan makes much more sense for the village as a whole the busy turning is near the school and the new development sites need to be safe and as uncongested as possible	1		1		1				1		
48	2	Secondly will be affordable dwellings accommodate young single parents as there's been a single parent family residing in the property designed for the elderly of the village for several years this cannot be conclusive for a peaceful retirement for those who are elderly in the nearest flats at the bottom of Braunston Lane how was this allowed to happen							1				
48	3	Finally will the Village Hall relocation be incorporated into this project											1
49	1	We are very keen to embrace new development within the Staverton Parish Council as long as it can be controlled the suggestion of a small development on the site behind side the school is ideal would limited number of houses an excellent developer and the fantastic offer of a carpark obviously much needed as the complaints regarding parking or constant	2		2		2		2		2		
50	1	I favour no sites Daventry DC has enough allocated for six years if Staverton neighbourhood development choose sites then that gives green light developers to apply immediately		1		1		1		1		1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
50	2	any guarantee from developers not to increase number of units in application consultant said site size couldn't be increased as it would be into open country surely both sites are currently open country so this will set a precedence											1
50	3	Note re site one quite a few people from outside the village come to walk down Braunston Lane they park immediately opposite proposed entrance to site will this be catered for											1
51	1	There are good reasons for not nominating specific sites in the village at this stage the agreed DDC policy is to encourage development around Daventry town rather than in villages DDC currently has in excess of its required land supply quota and its quota for Rural housing has been exceeded the plan covers the period up to 2029 but selecting now gives an impression that residents are in favour of early development of specific sites this is an unreasonable interpretation of the questionnaire responses and reactions at public meetings any developer will eventually have to make a planning application to the DDC and at that time demonstrate amongst other things the suitability of the site by commenting on the issue in the plan the Parish Council is essentially pre-empting whatever comments its successor may wish to make maybe many years hence selecting sites in the plan gives the related developers and unfair advantage over other developers who may come up with other schemes which may in the future		2		2		2		2		2	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
		side of Daventry Road. Thank you taking the time to invite ???? views and feedback to the village.											
57	1	I support the views of two of the residents at the meeting that there should be mixed housing on both sites with no more executive type homes and hopefully no further expansion for the foreseeable future.	1		1		1		1		1		
57	2	The car park behind the school should be kept as a village / visitors' amenity (resident parking excluded) for access to the school and for whoever has the authority to so making it mandatory for school run drivers to use the car park. It can be done. Or having an 'in – out' access with drop off in front of the school building. It would ease the perennial problem of selfish, dangerous parking.											1
57	3	And all building to be in keeping with the village environment.											1
58	1	??? and I have lived and farmed in Staverton Parish for over 40 years. We fully support the NDP with named sites. The site next to the school and Braunston Lane with a mix of housing including affordable housing and bungalows, much needed for the young and the elderly.	2		2		2		2		2		

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
58	2	A community benefit has been offered on the site beside the school to accommodate parking for the village hall, the church and the school. This would be an important asset to the village as I am the Highways Representative on the P.C.C and have attended many meetings with N.C.C. Highways Dept. on behalf of the residents who constantly complain about serious parking issues but due to finance, the problem remains											2
59	1	A copy of this feedback form has been taken. In 2016, the parish questionnaire was delivered to 207 houses. 143 were completed, a response rate of 67% The data and attendant comments demonstrated that parishioners appreciated Staverton and wished for it to retain its distinctive character and were keen to resist over development. Indeed, when called to do so, 56% chose not to specify site for development. Thus, a specified sites plan is by no means a fully supported option. I vote for a plan with policies only where any potential developers must prove that their plan is in accord with our policies and relevant to our village.		1		1		1	1			1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
62	1	I have some issues with the 2 proposed sites. 1. Braunston Lane. The increased traffic along Braunston Lane. We still have problems with people going too fast past the playing field, some I think believe they are on the road to Daventry. I have witnessed on 3 occasions on skidding to a halt on the bridleway / footpath entrance. It needs better signage. It has been mentioned before. No action was taken. It is a dead end.		1		1		1				1	
62	2	2. Daventry Road site. When families take up these properties, will they replace outside attendees of the school or will this mean expansion. If so, I will be totally against.											1
63	1	It is a shame that issue of publishing sites (or not) has created a lot of bad feeling between some members of the village. Can this be solved by having a referendum on the matter?											1
63	2	Notwithstanding the above, it appears that a few individuals still think that the village should have no new houses at all. I thought that this was no longer an option and hasn't been for a few years. Maybe this needs explaining again to all and sundry.											1
63	3	Regarding the publication of sites, if the village has already agreed on the 1 st and 2 nd possible sites, I cannot understand why some villagers want to backtrack and publish this information. Then we would have to go through the whole process again. Maybe they think the process has not been democratic – is that true? If the NDP stipulates where development can occur,	1		1		1		1		1		

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
68	1	<p>A true consultation process listens to the views of local residents and does not shout them down and 'erroneously' state that no sites is not an acceptable view / option. In my opinion, none of the sites put forward for inclusion in the plan are suitable due to the fact that the road infrastructure of the village cannot cope with the number of residents and visitors (i.e. school run) vehicles. The roads are currently unsafe and require double yellow lines around the school particularly on the bend before a serious accident occurs. Additional development sites within the village will damage further the quality of life for the local residents due the additional traffic created by more houses. Road safety will be compromised as more cars on the daily commute will be trying to exit the village on to a very busy and fast main road causing queues to build up on the villages narrow roads. Add to the increase in village traffic to the school run traffic and this is a recipe for a disaster as it is already very difficult to get safely down to the junction with Daventry Road. As Daventry Council have already identified suitable development sites elsewhere which meet demand for a considerable number of years, I cannot see why Staverton is being forced to accept unsuitable development sites which could ruin it's character and endanger it's residents. I feel that no sites is the only suitable option for Staverton.</p>		1		1		1		1		1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
		<p>site in our Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst it is commendable that the Parish Council are seeking to mitigate the problem of parking, I believe this 'community benefit' has not been sufficiently thought through. The vast majority of pupils currently attending Staverton school live and travel in from areas outside of Staverton, this results in a high level of traffic at drop off and collection times. A car park of around 20 spaces has been included on the 'indicative' plan for Beside the School. This will in no way accommodate the full needs of the volumes of cars (both Teachers and parents), driving to the school each day. Lack of parking for the Village Hall is also cited as a problem by some in the Village, and the proposed car park is viewed by some on the SPC as the solution</p>											
70		<p>This all works well if users of the car park can find a space, and if not, they are prepared to wait for a space to become available. Will they be prepared to carry anything bulky or heavy to and back from the Village Hall? Will they be prepared to park and walk their child to school in ALL weathers, rather than do as they have always done and drop their child right at the front of the school? Will elderly worshipers attending services at the Church, want to walk that far, or park as they do now in the nearby roads? These are just a few scenarios, there are many more. Realistically we all know that some people may use the car park, but many will not. Sadly, Staverton is not alone in this predicament, which boils</p>											1

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
71	2	we do not however support the selection of sites that they have a clear robust policies that respect that we have a conservation village and our existing status as a restricted infill village in a special landscape area		2		2		2				2	
71	3	in particular we fully endorse the arguments highlighted and set out in the attached leaflet											2
71	4	we are concerned that the earlier consultation clearly advised that no development was not an option of you were challenged at the time given the clear miss reputation we have to question the validity of much of the feedback and regarded that new consultation should be carried out with the guidelines properly set out											2
71	5	furthermore we are aghast that the bases for determining the number of new homes required is a simple survey of households in the parish this is no more than opinion at the moment in time and should not serve as a sound basis for any planning policy											2
72	1	We must have a village policy and all houses must be built in the character with existing houses such as Windmill Gardens no sites that look like Toy town							1				1
73	1	Having heard all the arguments I feel the no site option will be best for Staverton Parish Council		1		1		1				1	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
75	7	there was a question at the meeting about garage sizes being beyond the controls of the parish more importantly is ensuring that all houses have adequate parking facilities no houses should be allowed with at least two offstreet parking spaces											2
75	8	additional problems might be capacity at the school ,local utilities - gas water electric and particularly sewage facilities (which is apparently overcapacity now) able to take the added demand required											2
75	9	It was stated at the meeting that the plan period is at 2029 the further development above that included within the plan would be permitted this is how strong the local plan is since 1949 have been no planning decision made without reference to the local plan											2
75	10	the threat is that if we don't designate sites in the village might be forced to take development that does not agree to if Daventry needs more sites which contradicts the statement above we are not sure that an accurate picture is been painted and what the plan is capable of and required for											2
75	11	overall after must discussion we feel that we prefer to rely on the use of robust policies special landscape area conservation village and restricted in the village control how any development takes place with no site selection		2		2		2		2		2	

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
80	1	I would like the vote on October 2016 to be cancelled as ??? said that three sites were to be voted on and a no site vote would be cancelled. As this misled the village to only choose from three sites. The vote was incorrect. If ??? had not hidden behind the screen during the meeting on Saturday 16 th Nov 2017 she could have had the courage to admit her faults instead of leaving ??? to wave piles of paper around which could not be seen. Perhaps he could explain his behaviour.		1		1		1		1		1	
80	2	As for the vote for no sites as this could change the village into a hub of Daventry and reduce the price of properties in the existing village.											
80	3	The car park is a nonsense as people will not walk the distance and cars delivering children to the school take the easier option to park for 5 minutes, nor will the village cover insurance for any cars there.											
80	4	The school can quite easily make a second entrance so cars can drive in one side of the road at the back of the school and drive out the second side.											
81	1	Concerned about extra traffic around congested Bend by school if Braunston Lane site gets approved						1					
82	1	Firstly I am not against some appropriate new housing many small properties for first-time buyers and bungalows for those that wish to downsize							1				

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017

			Sites	Sites	School (2)	School (2)	B/Lane (20)	B/Lane (20)	Housing	Housing	Community benefit	Community benefit	Comment
Ref	Para No	Comment	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	
TOTAL REPOSNSES PER SUPPORT/OBJECT			41	55	34	58	32	59	60	17	33	48	
TOTAL RESPONSES PER POLICY ITEM			96		92		91		77		81		
		Total Response rate per policy item against 2011 census of a population of 384	25%		24%		24%		20%		21%		
		Total Response rate per support/object as a percentage of responses received	43%	57%	37%	63%	35%	65%	78%	22%	41%	59%	
		Total Response rate as per object/support against 2011 census of a population of 384	11%	14%	9%	15%	8%	15%	16%	4%	9%	12%	

		Support	11.00%	9.00%	8.00%	16.00%	9%	
		Object	14.00%	15.00%	15.00%	4.00%	12%	
		Not expressed a view	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	80.00%	79%	

NB: Where the reference is coloured red the comment was from two persons
 The methodology and data analysis has been verified by the Parish Councils Consultants Kirkwells