Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 B/Lane School B/Lane School Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No I consider that sites should be included in the NDP - They can only assist in the 1 1 1 selection of suitable sites for future development I consider sites 2 & 20 to be most suitable 1 2 1 1 1 sites in line with the results of the survey It is nonsense for any villager to suggest that they have not been consulted regarding the 3 work carried out by the PC, the working 1 1 group and consultants over the last few years I think the village would benefit from more 1 houses and more young people We consider the site at Braunston Lane (site 20) to be the most suitable. The Houses at that end of the village are more modern and 2 1 2 2 2 of brick construction therefore the new development would be in keeping There appears to be only one 2 bedroom 2 2 bungalow on the plan - we would like to see more, this would facilitate downsizing option We are a young family who live in the village. I would like to say that we are in favour of a small development behind the school with car parking. We find parking is a real issue and we would love to see more 1 2 2 2 2 younger families in the village to fill the school and bring life to the village. Some more village amenities like a shop would be favourable. Possibly a new village hall by the car park to bring more activities and accessibility. So we 2 2 see the village thriving and alive.

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 4 | 1 | Agree that sites for development should be named (there will be development and it would be great to have some sort of control over it) | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 4 | 2 | Do not think developers should be named in the plan | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | We do need some assurance that any development does keep to our preferred numbers and not gradually increase size that the village prefers | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 4 | 4 | Did not understand what the consultants said about the 'development boundary' | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 4 | 5 | This new proposal from DDC. Can we object please? | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | I am unable to support the Draft Staverton Neighbourhood Development Plan in its present form. I am of the opinion that sites should NOT be specified within the plan. I urge the Parish Council to reconsider. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 6 | 1 | SPECIFIC SITES SHOULD <u>NOT</u> BE INCLUDED IN THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 6 | 2 | It would now appear to be that at the start of this process, we, the residents of Staverton, had not been given the full facts or sufficient options to questions in the questionnaire. We should have been given the option of suggesting 'No Sites' for future development. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 6 | 3 | The SPC are suggesting two sites to enable development and building of 15 properties. If DDC were in fact looking for Staverton to provide sites for development, then they would be aware of proposed future development in Manor Road and the four properties under construction in Badby Road. So there is no need to offer sites for 15. | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 6 | 4 | At this early stage of any future development consideration, I am at a loss as to how SPC can be talking to specific developers and discussing any 'gains' such as car parks when nobody knows where sites might be, how big the sites might be, if any sites are actually needed and more importantly, if the existing residents actually want any further development. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 6 | 5 | And why do we see the car parking as a gain on the site next to the school? The only answer to car parking is yellow lines. SPC provided funds to support the drop off of school children at the Countryman. It didn't work. A leaflet drop in the village implied that action would be taken against illegal parking. Apart from this not being progressed, I still await some comments back from the SPC to the comments email that I was invited to send back in October. As previous attempts to alleviate parking problems have failed, does SPC honestly believe that creating a few extra inaccessible parking spaces will make any difference to people using the village hall? Legal parking is available in Daventry Road but is not used by people attending the village hall as it is too far to walk. The same would apply to any additional parking spaces that are not directly outside the hall. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 6 | 6 | My thoughts after the opening meeting was that the Development Plan was about developing the village. I thought that this would take into account ALL aspects of village life, not just where to put more houses. The priorities should be for our quality of life. We need solutions to the illegal car parking, noise pollution, lack of a bus service. For many residents, the only lifeline of Daventry Connect, the Community Bus service, will be terminated next year. Offering to provide sites to build more houses will only worsen the current unacceptable nuisances we have to suffer - | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 B/Lane School B/Lane School Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No more noise, more parking problems and no bus service. Please submit the Development Plan with 1 6 'NO SITES' I am concerned about the threat to Staverton by DDC's plans to expand Daventry to the West side of the Daventry 1 1 bypass. Talks are already being undertaken with landowners for an 800 houses development. I do not believe that Staverton can stop Daventry expanding to absorb Staverton if 2 you take a 30-year view. To protect 1 1 1 1 1 Staverton we should resist all further development There is a need for social and affordable 8 1 1 houses in Staverton. For any future development basic 8 2 1 infrastructure must seriously be considered. I feel it is better to include the Braunston 8 3 Lane and the Daventry Road with car parking 1 1 1 1 in the NDP than to say no sites. If Daventry has enough development land at the present, who is to know what 1 8 4 government will direct in 5 years' time. Site no 2 next to the school will provide all 9 1 1 1 1 the requests of the inhabitants of Staverton. The affordable housing, releasing the dangerous congestion on the narrow roads 9 2 1 around the school. Also provide parking for the village hall which the residents have

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 B/Lane School School B/Lane Community Community Sites Sites Housing Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Ref Comment Support Object Support Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No voted to keep I agree with the current draft plan and the 1 10 1 1 1 sites suggested. I believe small small developments are the 2 10 1 1 way forward I think the provision of car parking is an 10 3 1 excellent idea and very much needed 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 11 1 1 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 Thank you for the consultation event yesterday. It made it even clearer that in order to protect our village as much as 12 1 1 1 possible we need both houses and allocated sites. My preferred site is next to the school and 2 12 1 all 15 houses on the same site My concerns about Braunston Lane site is the extra traffic along Braunston Lane, this is already basically a one way road with only 12 3 1 half the road usable. People do not keep to speed signs and this road passes/includes the village playing field. I also agree with community benefit of a car park and further discussion with the school 12 to ease the flow of traffic in Glebe Lane. This would also benefit the village if it were next to the school.

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 School **B/Lane** B/Lane School Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No Thank you to all who helped with the 5 proceedings, the consultants definitely 12 1 improved understanding of the process The village should allow for more dwellings 13 1 1 to be built No more than ten to fifteen I think the site should be on the Daventry 2 Road next to the Windmill Gardens Also 1 13 consider what type of houses are being built I do disagree on the Braunston Lane site (20) 3 13 1 too much traffic going into the one area Site (2) next to the school there should be 13 4 more houses built not just 10 it should be a 1 1 lot more 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 1 1 1 1 14 1 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 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 2 1 up like Sixfield and spoil the look of the village. Again too many cars going through the village 14 3 What about our bus route? 1 There is a need for more houses in every part of the country and Staverton in the long 15 1 1 run is no exception. Various developments have fitted in guite well and limited further

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | d on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | development should be encouraged. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 2 | AS 'in fill' is about completed and with the village status probably changing up to 18/20 houses should be allowed/encouraged | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 3 | of various sites considered the school site is probably the best. | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 4 | The car park should be as near to the school as possible and should have vehicle access to it adjacent the school | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 16 | 1 | Much of the meeting was a waste of time due to poor chairmanship as very few of the audience had a chance to express their opinion. You must have one chair to control speakers | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 16 | 2 | The association of Avant Builders to the Parish Council worries me. They were not able to answer any several important questions put to them. It has been widely publicised that small plots are too expensive for builders to make a profit. When asked what would the cost of the affordable house they refused to answer. If they don't know what a house cost they have not worked out the cost of the development. At least they could have said - at present costs of two bedroom would cost between £x and £y | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 16 | 3 | Why are no other builders interested? I feel to continue with AVANT homes might suggest unfair practice You must get other quotes for this site to be above suspicion | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 16 | 4 | The car park - much discussed but never specified. How big should it be? Looking at the cars parked collecting children from school - it should need upward of 50 places. Then where do you put the houses? If it were used for Village Hall meetings at night would it be well lit with CCTV or will you get the crime rate Staverton Park Hotel used to get? | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 16 | 5 | Lastly what on earth were Kirkwells present at this meeting for? I heard nothing from them that I had not heard from my days on the Parish Council committee when ??????? was Chair. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 16 | 6 | Lastly, communication is very poor, in an hour of searching past meeting minutes last night I still could not find how you had reduced the number of potential sites. Detail and reasoning may be there but I could not find it. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 17 | 1 | My family and I moved to Staverton in 1994. Our solicitors advised us that Staverton was a lovely village, but was currently a 'divided' village. All to do with planning and a golf course complex, I believe. In other words, the subject of planning had caused very harmful differences of opinion that nearly destroyed the village community. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 17 | 2 | I came away from the Consultation Event on Saturday with the same sort of foreboding - a district 'déjà vu' feeling. Raw hostility has no place in our village. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 17 | 3 | Please let us avoid the divided village scenario this time. Feelings are running strong and high and action needs to be taken ASAP. Whatever the rights or wrongs that echoed throughout the meeting yesterday, the Staverton Parish Council must act now to sustain the village community. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 17 | 4 | It is time for individuals to meet with individuals, small groups, the council with whoever they need, to agree consensus, however wide. The object being to achieve the best way to contain the number and type of future housing within our special conservation area. Of course there are pros and cons on both sides, emotional, realistic and bureaucratic. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 17 | 5 | The lead that James Jackson Stops gave was positive. A proposed site owner, who wanted to work with the village. | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 17 | 6 | It is now up to the PCC to pull together, be positive, listen to those in the village who feel really strongly one way or the other, discuss and work out how a consensus can be reached, not to be overawed by outsiders and GOOD LUCK | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | I am surprised that the arguments regarding sites was not put to the vote. My impression was that the meeting was overwhelmingly against designated sites for development. I see no point in calling a crucial meeting of the villages and then denying them the right to vote on the main issue in hand. Was this because the PC would have to retract your members lost real credence by not balloting on this issue. Aa was so firmly stated by Mr lan Weaver if people turn up they will have a chance to have an input. Well they turned up! is there a contradiction here? there was evidence in abundance that the present position of the council is on untenable. You should retract or resign it's called democracy | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 19 | 1 | 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 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 19 | 1 | Consequently I would recommend that a careful communication plan is formed by the Parish Council so that people can be made aware of future plans not just email regular short meetings and flyers which can either be collected by villagers or easily distributed | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 20 | 1 | Further to the recent Parish Council Newsletter of November 2017, unfortunately we were not able to make the Consultation on 18th November. We are therefore e-mailing with comments regarding the Neighbourhood Development Plan. | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 20 | 2 | It is our considered view that possible future development sites should not be allocated now but addressed on a case by case basis as and when the landowner/developer chooses to bring a planning application forward. Each site can then be considered on it's merits at the time. Otherwise sites maybe predetermined when the landowner does not wish to develop them and so on. | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | |
| 20 | 3 | It is also our considered view that the majority of houses built in the village should be affordable houses to allow the younger generation to move in to the village which would otherwise be prohibitively expensive. | | | | | | | 2 | | | | |
| 21 | 1 | I agree that a neighbourhood plan is a document that will be of benefit to Staverton. It is a shame that the Committee / Working Group has been disbanded, they have completed so much time consuming research and document preparation. Parish Council minutes are less than complimentary about this group of people. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 21 | 2 | I was part of the Working Group when the Vision, Objectives and Goals were formulated. I agree with these, although there could have been better people participation in their formulation. The vision was taken from other neighbourhood plans and the wording changed to suit responses from Staverton Questionnaire. This was then displayed on a board at a village meeting. No-one commented on it and so it was approved. In my view, this method of compiling a document for the village is very wrong. Villagers should have been given the opportunity to participate in discussion about the Vision etc and given ownership of these. I believe in full participation by the people of Staverton in collating this extremely important document. It is not an excuse to say that people are not interested. As Councillors, it is your duty to ensure that people from the village are involved. If the people don't come to you, you must go to them. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 21 | 3 | Your newsletter states that site selection is only one way to control future development, another way is robust policies. Policies need to be agreed and collated by villagers, not consultants who have only been in our village for a few weeks. What has happened to the policies that were started many months ago by me? Why have they not been completed before Developers were invited to make their presentations? Surely Developers should be using policies to enable them to determine the type of | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | building that meets the needs of Staverton. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | 4 | In the Questionnaire we were not given an option to vote for a no sites option, hence the data regarding site choice is inaccurate. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 21 | 5 | I believe in strong robust policies, not site selection. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | 6 | There does need to be some development in Staverton. However, the facilities here do not support large development. There is no shop, no bus service, no post office and the school is full. A car park by the school has little relevance. Parents will not use it and other people will not park their car away from where they are visiting. New home owners will probably use the car park themselves, but who would want to buy a new house with a car park next to it? | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 21 | 7 | In future, I would like to see improved engagement of people from the village in the compilation of the plan. Please ensure that documents are shared at draft stages, not after they have been approved and finalised. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 21 | 8 | There are still villagers who do not know about the plan. More notices around the village are required – big ones as Badby have done. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 21 | 9 | Fewer formal meetings and more come and look. No more secret meetings. People have busy lives and may not be able to come to the many meetings; also they may not feel welcome. Go door to door, use the internet, have a Facebook site etc. Give plenty of notice about meetings too. Be more approachable. Be ready to listen and respond rather than shout down or at people, as some Councillors have done. If the public views are to be valued, these need to be minuted accurately at meetings. If Councillors do not have faith in each other over accurate minutes, how is the public expected to believe what is said. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 21 | 10 | Please try to engage all residents in some way, it is much better than the divide that we currently have. Everyone has worked so hard on the plan, don't waste it. Many people are now against the plan and do not believe what is said to them by Councillors. The Parish Council has caused this by their inconsistency, their public arguing and their unwillingness to act with transparency. Agendas get changed at short notice, they are not displayed promptly and previous minutes appear a day before the meeting. I believe that such matters need to be addressed in order to restore faith in the Neighbourhood Development Plan. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 21 | 11 | I thank those people who have spent so much time collating the current information for the plan and hope that the future brings better relationships within the Village. I am sure that this is what our Parish Council hopes to achieve. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 21 | 12 | The comments stated are a result of my conversations with people in the village. I also check notice boards and the web site daily. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 22 | 1 | The Parish Council (PC) state regarding the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) that "Daventry District Council advise that SITE SELECTION is only one way to control future development. Another way is to have ROBUST POLICIES in our plan" but this part/route has never been even examined by the PC and has been further ruled out of court by the guidance from the PC (wrongly) that the Plan put forward to the DDC must nominate specific sites. Instead the PC has charged down the route of "site selection", expending time, money (consultants) and effort without any reference to the village that this the way we want to go. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 22 | 2 | I have little knowledge on how ROBUST POLICIES are defined in the planning world but a statement along the lines of " Staverton village want 15 houses to be built on the next 12 years to accommodate "natural" growth and development and these should be mix of 2, 3, and 4 bedrooms homes" would meet the DDC requirements. Land owners and developers would follow current building plan applications with the PC and DDC Planning Department assessing if the planning application fitted into that policy. If after ,say 10 years , only 6 new houses had been built , consideration would be given by the then PC of developing a policy of attracting developers / land owners to release sites for new houses | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 22 | 3 | I see no advantage or requirement to continue the current policies which give commercial advantage to consultants (and I bet they did not discuss or advised that delaying decisions on the village plan would be/could be to the advantage of the village.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | 4 | Another comment re a carpark; a carpark to reduced the level of on street parking will have no effect unless there is a village "rule" of only one car may park on the street per house I cannot see this being agreed by the village but I could be wrong. | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 22 | 5 | Alas the meeting on Saturday was a total failure in that there was no real discussions and attendees left more confused than on arrival. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 27 | 1 | The evidence and points put forward at the NDP in the village hall on Saturday November 18 th were relayed to me so my answer is as follows: I am in favour of suitable affordable housing being built in Staverton but the question of which site or sites should not be included in the NDP at this stage. I stress that I do not want possible sites outlined in the plan at the present time. May I add my thanks to all who have been involved in drawing up this NDP. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 28 | 1 | After careful consideration, we are of the opinion that whilst a plan with policies in place is a good thing, naming individual sites is not. Whilst in the future there may possibly be plans put forward to build new houses, this is the time to use the policies in the plan to protect the village and then either approve or fight any such application. We therefore feel that no sites should be named in the plan. | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | |
| 29 | 1 | I agree with both the sites currently proposed by the Parish Council. | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 29 | 2 | Daventry District is coming under increasing pressure to provide new housing. They have already stated that the plan is to increase the size of the town substantially. It is only a matter of time until they will have to build on land to the southwest of the town, land that is currently in Staverton Parish. | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | d on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 29 | 3 | A Neighbourhood Development Plan is one of the main tools that can be used to resist unwarranted development. Selecting sites within the plan will be a main anchor point ensuring unwanted or speculative development is resisted. | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 29 | 4 | Not specifying sites will leave the village wide open. Each planning application will have to be fought individually. No community benefit need be offered above the standard CIL / 106 agreements. We would have very little control specifying the type of properties built and we will not be able to continue to refuse all applications until we find a 'nice' one. | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 30 | 1 | My vote is for Staverton Parish Council to select as option 1: The school site with carpark. As option 2: The Braunston Lane site. As option 3: Both the above sites for the future development of Staverton for many years to come. Having no agreed site or sites is not an option in my view. | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 31 | 1 | Both sites as per Parish Council plan | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 32 | 1 | Both sites as suggested | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 33 | 1 | Whilst I am not against change and development in the village I do have concerns after attending the meeting in the village hall on 18/11/17. Having been a resident for 27 years and associated with the village for 7 years prior to this through the pub which mum & dad ran, I have the villages best interests at heart. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | æ | 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 Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | 5 | They were a breath of fresh air in a somewhat tense meeting actually listening to the concern about parking. For me if I had to choose a site it would be this project as I believe it won't add to the problem of parking around the school. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 33 | 6 | One concern is though sewage. In the past we have had a problem with this that would have to be looked at. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 33 | 7 | To sum my thoughts up, we need affordable housing so we can encourage young families in to our village. More bungalows so that us with larger houses can down size and stay in the village. | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 33 | 8 | Avant are a large company that build large expensive houses. Who will be able to afford these in a village, not young people just starting out! | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 33 | 9 | Braunston Lane site, won't be out of place as our houses at this end of the village are a mixture of properties. The parking won't be a problem there also. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | Having attended the meeting in the village hall on Sat 18 th 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 1 st refusal of these. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 B/Lane School School **B/Lane** Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (20) (20) benefit (2) benefit Para Ref Comment Support Object Support Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No 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 2 2 35 1 2 2 may be not the best option in the coming years. Better for a developer to follow normal channels when the need arises I would like to express my opinion that I do 1 not think there should be any sites for 36 1 1 1 1 1 building in our village please no sites I am against sites being included in a neighbourhood plan don't wish for further build being in village but believe in fill in 37 1 1 1 1 1 1 where possible I chose to live in a village and enjoy community spirit I shame to spoil it I think the village plan should be submitted 38 1 1 1 1 1 1 but no specific sites should be mentioned I do not want designated sites no sites is an 39 1 1 1 1 1 option that should be adopted I do not want designated sites i.e. no site 1 village plan policies should be governing any 40 1 1 1 1 future building In response to your request for feedback, we fully support the principle and value of a 1 Neighbourhood Development Plan and 41 1 thank all those who have worked to get the plan to an advanced stage. We do not however, support the selection of specified sites but favour clear, robust policies that respect that we are a 2 2 2 2 2 41 1 conservation village and our existing status as a restricted infill village in a special landscape area.

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 School B/Lane School B/Lane Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No In particular, we fully endorse the arguments highlighted and set out in the attached 41 3 1 leaflet. 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 41 misrepresentation we have to question the 1 validity of much of the feedback and would argue that new consultation should be carried out with the guidelines properly set Furthermore, we are aghast that the basis for determining the number of new homes required is a simple survey of households in 5 41 1 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! We would prefer no site to be included in the upcoming Staverton neighbourhood 42 1 2 2 2 2 development plan I am in agreement with the plan for 15 new dwellings in the parish i.e. smaller 43 1 1 developments I do not agree that the sites should be 2 43 1 1 1 1 designated at the present time I always said that Parish should've been 1 consulted before the plan was put into 44 1 operation I feel there is no need for any formal sites in 2 44 1 1 1 1 the village

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 B/Lane School School B/Lane Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No please contact me about the Sewerage works and it's limited capacity for growth it 44 3 1 already has to be emptied by tankers fortnightly Do not want sites included within 45 1 1 1 1 neighbourhood plan It is my opinion that sites should not be included within the development plan we should have been given the option in the original questionnaire suggesting no sites for future development in view of the fact that 46 1 the DC propose to build 800 homes 1 1 1 1 bordering on to Staverton boundaries this must negate the need to build additional houses within the village especially as houses are already being built on Badby Road The village should have been clearly informed from the outset that there was an 47 1 option for having a plan with no sites should the majority vote in the referendum for sites to be named there should not be a requirement for developers to be involved 2 1 1 1 1 1 or named until such time as we are put in a position by DDC where we have to consider building. the plan should just name 'sites' we should ascertain that couples are prepared to constructively assist with the 47 3 1 plan even if the village vote for no sites Seven Trent should confirm it can handle 47 4 additional buildings this may have been 1 done

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 specifics sites this is an unreasonable interpretation of the questionnaire responses and reactions at public meetings any developer will eventually have to make a planning a 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 it 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 School B/Lane School B/Lane Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No to prove to be more attractive Following on from what I perceived as a shambolic consultation meeting in the 52 1 1 Village Hall I would like to make the following comments I think that the village plan should go 52 2 1 1 1 1 forward without any designated sites if there is to be a carpark in any future 52 3 development next to the school they i.e. the 1 school need to be in on the discussion I did not trust the gentleman from Avant 52 1 homes to deliver only 11 units the Parish Council need to listen to the 5 village and not appear to have their own 52 1 agenda Following the meeting on Saturday with your 53 1 best was a mess I would like to make a few 1 comments some people stated they did not see the need for more houses without small 2 53 1 developments the village will surely die we need some three-bedroom houses as 3 well as some two-bedroom affordable 53 1 houses there is a great need for car parking at the school which would be convenient in 53 4 1 Simon's paddock which should not have discounted 5 53 I certainly no trust in Avant homes 1

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 54 | 1 | I am against any sites been included in the neighbourhood development plan as this moment in time the reason for my decision is that we as parishioners were never given the pros and cons of each of the sites suggested by the parishioners as well as these on the original list in an acceptable format i.e. a letter to each household having to look at the village noticeboard board go to a PC meeting looking on the parish website were all totally unacceptable | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 55 | 1 | Following the consultation meeting, I have a few concerns over the production / dissemination of information through this process. I am pro development as long as it is proportionate and suitable to the setting in which it is applied. The recent consultation meeting gave the impression that no sites would equal no plan and that the only way development could be controlled was via allocations. I do not believe there has been enough engagement with the village on the NO Sites option. I have signed the recent petition but only on the basis of trying to instigate further discussion around how a NO Site option would work on a policy basis. Without this knowledge which I believe is lacking village wide, I am unable to make an informed decision. As mentioned, I am pro development but it must be proportionate and appropriate. I do believe that allocating sites gives us this control but I do not understand the methodology of a No Sites option and need to get to grips with this | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18 th 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 | |
| | | first. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | 2 | Regarding the 2 allocations, I am content with these sites but they should be designed to prevent further development sporning off them via 'roads to nowhere' in the current designs. I suspect the larger development Avant Homes would lose interest if they were prevented from further development beyond 11 homes. | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 55 | 3 | I also believe that the plan should include a design code to ensure any proposals put forward are within acceptable design standards. This will hopefully protect the aesthetics of the village. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 56 | 1 | We agree that having a clear plan for the village is a good thing. We agree and recognize that there is a need for a low degree of selective development in the village to create new dwellings. The suggested sites for this development are a satisfy solution. | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 56 | 2 | We view the opportunity of generating extra space for car parking as a further positive thing for the village in light of increasing car congestion. | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 56 | 3 | We also feel that further wider development around the village periphery would not be a good thing. The surrounding areas that create a natural perimeter around Staverton should be protected to avoid further housing development (particularly large scale development too) and this includes outlying areas such as Badby Lane and fields either | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18 th 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 18 th 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 18 th 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 | |
| 60 | 1 | Against specific sites. I am totally against specifying sites in the village plan. Moreover, by selecting a site outside the village confines, the Staverton Parish Council endorses the concept of building in the open countryside. How in years to come could they argue against further development outside the village confines? The village of Staverton already has sufficient protections to control future expansion. By choosing a site the SPC guarantees that building will take place now. A copy of this form has been made. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 61 | 1 | Braunston Lane Site would cause more traffic and increase parking problems. | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 61 | 2 | School site the proposal of 20 car park would do nothing to help with parking. People would park in doorways if they could. Apparently, it is said that if families bought the new houses, it would reduce people coming from outside the village. What happens do children have to leave the school to make room or are we talking about expansion. At the meeting on Saturday, there was a lot of arguments regarding sites or no sites. There was a lot of verbal attacks. Therefore, all this has caused a lot of bad feeling in the village. Therefore, surely there has to be some sort of agreement and stop the bickering before any proposal can be accepted. At the meeting there were some comments which were just downright rude. I thought we were grownups, not children | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 B/Lane School School B/Lane Community Community Sites Housing Sites Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No that will prevent speculative planning applications surely? Regarding the development near the school, locating the carpark is a key decision and it has to be nearest the school and village hall. Fundamental details such as this need the 63 1 backing of villagers. Also, does this scheme allow for future expansion into the area North of the site? I would like to register my support for the proposed development plan and the provision of housing and additional village parking behind the school. I am wholeheartedly in favour of a new development which will give younger 64 1 families the opportunity to live in the 1 1 1 1 1 village. Our village desperately needs to attract such people who will populate the school, and hopefully bring back the the vibrant community feel that was evident when I first moved to the village some 31 years ago. The suggested site will have minimal impact on the village and offer a real benefit in terms of parking for the school and village hall. Living opposite the school, this is 2 1 64 something that has become a real problem, so a developer who will offer a means of reducing the issue is a really attractive proposition. Furthermore, I believe that the developer in question will provide high quality residences 3 1 64 which will be sympathetic with the look and feel of the village.

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 64 | 4 | In closing, I would like to add that it is really disappointing that some individuals are seemingly blind to the need for development in order for the village to grow and thrive, and are apparently 'hell bent' on bullying and cajoling the rest of us in order to get their own way. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 65 | 1 | A local plan should be adopted but with no designated sites. Please remember the Parish Council should be the voice of the village, not individuals. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 66 | 1 | I believe the best way to ensure appropriate housing growth and development in Staverton village is to develop and adopt a local plan with policies based around Staverton being a 'special landscape area' and conservation village / restricted infill village with no designated sites. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 67 | 1 | In reference to the SNDP site assessment final report prepared by AECOM in a report that promotes transparency, I saw no program for site 2 when all the other sites had the full information available. One wonders what may or may not be concealed information on this particular site. This site seems to be immune from some of the constraints that site 4 also poses e.g. being adjacent to a conservation area Also outside the settlement boundary. This appears to be a major constraint for site 4 yet is merely waved for site 2. The report is inconsistent and quite greatly misleading given the information that was available to the SNDPC and AECOM. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 67 | 2 | Site 20 seems to overlook the congestion of cars on Braunston Lane. I'm aware the planning associates / promotors of this site appear convinced that everyone will always park on their driveway and never on the road but this is ridiculous. I dread to think the consequences if a fire engine of ambulance was really needed in an emergency someday because of ?????????? careless parking on ?????? roads with driveways on ????????? I'd just like to remind the planners that access for HGV and agricultural vehicles is required 24/7 and already this is compromised without adding any more houses and they multiply cars to the situation. | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 67 | 3 | On a ??????? point, site 2 appears to be quite the nature reserve. Prime woodcock ground and habitat for native and migrating species. Site 2 adjacent to a conservation area perhaps should be included in the conservation area. As site 2 appears to support a lot more wildlife and diversity than some other sites. I suppose it depends on what or whichever is to be conserved. | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 67 | 4 | In conclusion, I appreciate that a lot of fantastic work has been completed tirelessly by all of the members of the SNDPC. It's a shame it wasn't quite completed to it's ????? transparent depth that it could have been. The report unfortunately is not impartial and appears to be a promotion to certain sites. The allocation of sites process clearly was inconsistent and I fear undemocratic and therefore, I believe failed. | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | No site allocation appears to be a way around the process. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | 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. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 69 | 1 | I am unable to support the Draft Staverton Neighbourhood Development Plan in its present form, in terms a of site selection. I am of the opinion that a site or sites should be specified within the plan, but not the larger site as selected. I urge the Parish Council to reconsider. The full potential of the site behind Silver Birch was too eagerly disregarded and without proper consideration. | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 69 | 2 | I remain unhappy with the process that led to this selection which was at times improper and constantly corrupted in this poor democratic procedure. No reasons for this selection or otherwise has ever been agreed by either the Committee or the Parish Council. Even so, reasons made up after the event by certain individual members were submitted to the Consultants with no democratic authority from the Committee. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 69 | 3 | The ill thought through, so called Community Benefit (car park next to and for the School) was the driving factor for those certain members who had little or no development experience and little concern for the real possibilities of the Localism Act. Any desire to establish an enlargement to the Village which would quickly and seamlessly integrate into the community both Architecturally and Socially as defined in the Plan, was abandoned. Those certain members were dazzled by short term freebies. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 69 | 4 | The manner in which the dissolution of the SNDP Committee was managed, is an example of this poor democratic procedure and has now set the community against the Plan and against the Parish Council in general as the custodians of the Plan. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 69 | 5 | Unless there is some serious change in direction, the outcome of the Referendum will be easy to predict. I am doubtful that those same certain members any longer have the confidence of the community to continue with the Plan. I firmly believe, that they should consider their position. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 70 | 1 | I do not want sites to be included in the NDP. My reasons are specified on the attached which has also been sent to the clerk of Staverton Parish Council. | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 70 | | I do not believe there is a compelling argument for including sites within our Neighbourhood Plan. The assertion by both members of the SPC and Kirkwells Consultants that if sites are not included, then we are open to speculative developers building what and wherever they like, is questionable. We currently have no plan, and yet there are no speculative developers hammering at the door. Ask yourselves why the prospective developers you invited to the event, don't just go ahead with a planning application now. Answer: because it would be turned down. Both in DDC's current Local Plan and within the emerging part 2 Consultation there is a clear directive | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 School **B/Lane** B/Lane School Community Community Sites Sites Housing Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Support Ref Comment Support Object Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No that the rural housing need has been exceeded and that no further allocations will be made in rural areas unless sites are included within Neighbourhood Plans. In addition to this clear statement of intent by DDC the following are also factual reasons 70 1 not to include sites with the Neighbourhood Plan:-56% of Villagers who responded to the 70 Questionnaire in March 2016 did not 1 indicate a site Only 16% of the Village voted for the 70 1 school site, 12% behind Silver Birch, and 7% for Braunston Lane 'No Sites' was never presented as an option in either the Village Questionnaire or on the 70 1 Village Voting Form We have a raft of DDC policies that protect 70 1 our village Daventry District Council have exceeded the amount of land bank (5yrs) that is required by the Government. They currently have 70 1 6.3 years and a number of large potential developments identified in the emerging Part 2 consultation document 6 of 7 neighbouring Villages have wisely chosen not to include sites in their plans, 70 1 which have been accepted by both DDC and independent examiners. The plans that landowners and/or developers produced are indicative, and therefore they are not legally or otherwise 1 70 obliged to deliver them. Both the proposed sites have more land than is needed for

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | small scale development. We are told it is only 15 houses, however, all over the country developers argue that small numbers are not viable, and councils are allowing them to build more. We are told that sites will have to deliver 40% of the site in the form of affordable housing. Once again across the Country developers argue that this is not a viable option, which is frequently accepted by Local Councils. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | No sites does not mean no new housing. Any future developer could put forward a scheme via the existing planning process, which would be assessed against the Neighbourhood Plan policies, the existing village protections i.e. Restricted infill, Conservation Area, Special Landscape Area, and DDC Local policies. Parishioners would then get to see outline development plans and decide on a case by case basis if the Development would benefit Staverton. We would also be in a far better bargaining position to get what we want in terms of type, location and pace of development. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 70 | | The DDC Housing Needs Survey (2017) reported that 11 existing residents of Staverton expressed that they have or may have a housing need within the next 5years. Of course, in any community it is reasonable to hold the belief that older villagers wishing to downsize and younger family member wanting a home of their own, should ideally be able to remain in the Village. Responses to the Village Questionnaire stated overwhelmingly that these houses should be | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | affordable to Locals. Some members of the SPC and former SNDPC took this to mean affordable housing. It is NOT the same thing. Under legislation 40% of any development should be Affordable Housing, but anyone owning an existing home will not qualify for these. Any younger person will also not automatically qualify, but will be assessed against a number of criteria along with others on housing waiting lists. Smaller size market properties may help with affordability. However, as 'open market' properties these will be available for purchase by anyone resident or non-resident alike. I do not believe that without a legal contract this type of housing will be delivered. Staverton is a highly desirable village and the Developers know that. Have a look at what Avant have built in Kilsby, is | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | E600k really affordable! Parking in some areas of the Village is acknowledged as a cause for concern, notably around the school. Legally Northampton County Council are the authority responsible for parking enforcement. If vehicles cause an obstruction in the highway (including the footpath) then the Police have the power to issue a fixed penalty notice. Therefore, the Parish Council have no formal role, other than as a 'community partner'. However, Staverton Parish Council have decided that as a car park is being offered by the Developers of Beside the School, then this is a key factor for including it as a preferred | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | down to attitude. We know the school has tried to address this problem with various schemes, the latest was a trial of the 'Park and Stride', this was not continued due to lack of take up. That then leaves residents of this new development, will they be happy with a car park? I have seen no evidence that the concept of a car park was ever thoroughly thought through. And there is no guarantee that the car park on an 'indicative' | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | drawing will even be delivered. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | The intention of the Localism Act 2011 was to give communities more of a say in the development of their local plan. The Parish Council should therefore develop a plan that accords with the majority view of Parishioners. The message from the Consultation event was clear, a large number of Parishioners do not feel that they have been sufficiently consulted, and that they did not view the process to date as being open and transparent. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 70 | | I believe for all the above reasons that no sites should be included in the plan. If the majority of parishioners are of the same mind, I would expect the Parish Council to respect this and adapt the plan accordingly. The most important thing is that we have a Neighbourhood Plan which includes robust policies. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 71 | 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 work to get the plant to an advanced stage | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 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 Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 74 | 1 | We at ?????? support the current plan to develop next to the school site to and feel inclusion of a carpark is the master service to school and reduce parking in residential areas we also support the proposal or small properties to both allow young people to be able to buy in the village we have two children who would both wish to do this and also accommodate people in the village wishing to downsize | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 75 | 1 | Unfortunately due to business commitments we could not attend the consultation event however we have read all the information on the parish website and had feedback about the consultation on the variety of attendees and would like to make the following comments | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 75 | 2 | it appears that if we agree to put specific sites into the neighbourhood plan that will definitely be given the go-ahead when planning permission was applied for we are watching villages around is growing residue gallant everywhere look at the development in Daventry floor Northampton and long Itchington Southam and Stockton just over the border into Warwickshire there seems to be a proposal to put 800 houses this side of the bypass if there are houses going that close do we actually need any additional ones in the village itself | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | 3 | I don't think we should be making it easy for the developers the idea that we are adding 15 dwellings into the village with the only benefit to the village been some parking adjacent to the school that the village will be paying for upkeep in due course seems unbalanced | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 75 | 4 | this is an extremely expensive village to buy into is it likely that even affordable sub £300,000 properties will be affordable for young couple starting out we certainly don't need any additional big non-affordable houses in the village that will become weekend retreats as so many of the houses in the village already are if the plan says yes to the site what controls of the village and what houses are built there | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 75 | 5 | there was a question at the meeting about heads of terms it was explained that any heads of terms would have to be with Daventry District Council and not the development committee all the PC it was also considered ahead of terms was not necessary as Avant was a progressive responsible home builder who is a commitment to the community to the building and the people that live within then | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 75 | 6 | it would seem appropriate to have a heads of terms the idea of relying on the homebuilder being responsible seems naive at the best | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 76 | 1 | I support the inclusion of a site in the plan so that the decision of where build occurs in the village is the decision of the Parish Council and thereby the villagers at a local level | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 76 | 2 | I support the site next to the school but consider the site in Braunston Lane not to be appropriate | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 76 | 3 | I would support just the one site with between 15-20 Houses on it | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 76 | 4 | In order to bring affordable Housing forward sites should be included within the plan. Residents ask that they want affordable housing for the village, without sites in the plan this will not be possible. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 77 | 1 | I support the inclusion of sites in the plan | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | 2 | I support both sites selected | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 77 | 3 | I support the car park | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 78 | 1 | There are many good parts to the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Staverton | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 2 | Site selection it's not one of them 'no sites' is now a better option to plan making process is flawed | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | 3 | As the last remaining non-councillor representing an ordinary parishioner view on the ANDP Committee when it was summarily dissolved, I can speak with certainty | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 78 | 4 | There was no call for sites as required under the legislation. The questionnaire responses are cited as such, but circulation of the Questionnaire was restricted to household and businesses that were active in the Parish. No wider 'Call' was made through advertising or by contracting known non resident landowners as required by the legislation | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 5 | Staverton Parish Council has from the inception of the plan wrongly propagated the message that 'No sites' is not an option | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 6 | This is concerning as at key stages there are minuted decisions taken by the Staverton Parish Council e.g 2nd of February 2016 where active promotion of just one site has been undertaken, Beside the School. No justification for this bias, which predates both Questionnaire and public vote on Large Sites has been offered within the record of the Parish Council or plan committee. That unjustified bias remains. | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 7 | The AECOM report is based on unauthorised information supplied by one Councillor. That information was challenged by the non-council members of the committee as heavily biased in favour of one site, Beside the School, a short while before the SNDP committee was dissolved The alternative site being near the nucleus of the conservation area of the village was a clearly expressed preference through the questionnaire to aid social and practical integration into the community. Not | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedba | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | a shortcoming, | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | 8 | Two of the Landowners/developers of the three shortlisted sites are recorded as prepared to agree a short contract to deliver what had been agreed in terms of number and type of property on this sites and the Boundry of their sites. The selected larger site Developers were not. The site was selected by the Parish Councillors | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 9 | This is misrepresentation of the facts in the Staverton Parish Council site assessment document of the chosen site. The main sewer from the 280 bedroom Stanton Park hotel runs directly through the chosen large site. It is not identified on the site assessment tool kit relating to the site. The sewer has an average fall of 1 in 145 and is in part above ground. Without active management it floods raw sewage into the village. Whilst only a building control issue, it will be expensive to resolve and increase the developmental cost significantly and provide a platform for changing the size of development required to pay for it. The document lists the sewer as being adjacent | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | d on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | to the site which is both inaccurate and misleading | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | 10 | The car park offered as a community benefit three options in terms of access layout, given always that it provides enough spaces. Fewer would make parking uncertain and increase congestion while seeking a space. The alternatives may be summarised as: a - access through the new development b - accessed by Glebe Lane c - separate access via Daventry Road | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 78 | 11 | Option A - access through the new development, simply moves the Glebe Lane traffic and parking issue to similarly effect those in the new development on the site. Option B - access via Glebe Lane would result in an extreme stream of vehicles crossing through the already congested child, parent and vehicular traffic in and around Glebe Lane at school times. Option C - separate access via the Daventry Road site entrance has already been rejected by AVANT as too elaborate for the scale of development required under the Neighbourhood Plan/HNS | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 12 | The whole approach to solving the parking around schools is universally excepted as an attitudinal issue on the part of those driving to the school so eloquently detailed by Claire Parker (Kirkwells) in the meeting | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 78 | 13 | The evidence supporting my view is contained within the plan documents and relevant minutes | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 1 | I believe that the plan should contain robust planning objectives include provision for modest 12 to 15 house development for the 12 years of its span I differ from the majority of the Parish Council in believing that it should not contain any reference to individual sites which may or may not be deemed suitable for development | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 79 | 2 | there are opposing risks inherent in any plan being processed in this case | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 79 | 3 | (a) the point argued by the consultant is that in the case that DDC runs out of it's required site quota in future years and takes no steps to replenish it ,the village would be vulnerable to random applications for development i,f no specific sites have been nominated effectively site nomination be seen not as desirable in its own right but as an insurance policy against the risk of DDC failing to act appropriately in the future against this DDC have in the past act responsibly in planning matters and I've been sympathetic to the village views might be expected to be so in future | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 4 | (b) while the plan as drafted limits development size there is a belief that 10 houses on the school site is uneconomic proposition with the housing mix and planning gain propose that the developer is adopting a toe in the door strategy there is no certainty that the eventual application will be limited to the size and the risk is that it will be argued that to be feasible 35 to 50 houses are needed and that as the village as already expressed a desire for this development by inclusion in its plan the adjustment should be accepted DDC might succumb to this argument | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 5 | possibility (b) is the more imminent risk and there is in my view a higher probability of it actually coming to pass there are other reasons for preefering to evaluate developments at the time of any eventual planning application rather than in the plan | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 79 | 6 | the plan covers the period up to 2029 selecting now gives an impression that residents are in favour of early development of specific sites this is an un reasonable interpretation of the questionnaire responses and reactions of public meetings | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 7 | any developer will eventually have to make a planning application to the DDC and at that time demonstrate among other things the suitability of the site by commenting on the issue in this plan the Parish Council is essentially pre-empting whatever comments it successor may wish to make maybe many years hence I'm in circumstances may be quite different | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 8 | selecting sites in the plan gives the related develop an unfair advantage over other developers who may come up with other schemes which may in the future proved to be more attractive thus securing from developers of planning gain is an issue better left to a time of specific proposals are included in an application and the village is it in a better position to understand what is in the prospect and bargain for improvements | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 9 | The consultation with the public has been patchy at best it was unfortunate that there was miss information no doubt entirely accidental at the earlier meeting which led parishioners to believe that if the plan was to be accepted, the nominaton of sites was ane essential feature. Because of this the answers to para 3.8 of the questionnaire based upon the wrong premises and must be regarded as invalid and should be | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| | | disregarded in any review of public reaction | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | 10 | It is understood that the issue of sites was a continuing source of dissension in the committee meetings with many split votes and disputes over the minutes and even over who had voted for what in theses circumstances explicit contact with parishioners to correct the earlier misinformation and explain the pros and cons of site nomination and asked for their views would have been appropriate | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 11 | In the event the Parish Council appeared at recent meetings to be reluctant to convene further meeting and when persuaded to do so but adamant that there will be no direct invitation to parishioners not attending meeting to express their opinion on this Bextor question as a result some parishioners filled the consultation vacuum by launching an Internet petition and question the results of which will be made available to those preparing the final draft of the plan | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 79 | 12 | Site selection is extremely contentious and has already caused much ill feeling in the community the tragedy is that it is not particularly relevant to a long-term strategy document of this sort as compared with the planning objectives and the definition of the extent of development over the 12 year period the extensive work that has been done in examining site is a matter of public record and will not be wasted and will be available for the benefit of future planning application the plan would be none the worse but excluding site selection | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 13 | Individual counsellors may themselves feel that a no nominated site outcome is unwise and not in the best interests of the village but many other parishioners certainly have different views if as I expect there is a clear majority in the feedback that site nomination should be excluded from the plan I hope that the Parish Council will feel able to yield to popular opinion and re-draft along these lines | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 79 | 14 | We do need a robust plan and this issue has already provided the community enough it would be a pity if finalisation founded upon this issue | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18th November 2017 B/Lane School B/Lane School Community Community Sites Sites Housing Housing Comment (2) (2) (20) (20) benefit benefit Para Ref Comment Support Object Support Object Support Object Support Object Support Object No 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 1 80 1 1 1 1 1 screen during the meeting on Saturday 16th 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. As for the vote for no sites as this could change the village into a hub of Daventry 2 80 and reduce the price of properties in the existing village. The car park is a nonsense as people will not walk the distance and cars delivering children to the school take the easier option 80 to park for 5 minutes, nor will the village cover insurance for any cars there. The school can quite easily make a second entrance so cars can drive in one side of the 80 road at the back of the school and drive out the second side. Concerned about extra traffic around 81 congested Bend by school if Braunston Lane 1 site gets approved Firstly I am not against some appropriate new housing many small properties for first-82 1 1 time buyers and bungalows for those that wish to downsize

| | Analysis of Feedback responses from consultation event held on the 18 th 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 | |
| 82 | 2 | on the issue of nominating site I am unsure if the consequence is to not specify okay but if we are going to nominate I would prefer to see the Braunstone Lane plan to go ahead building anywhere near the school I would not support due to the traffic situation finally thank you for all your hard work on what has quite clearly been a difficult time | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| 83 | 1 | I would support a controlled small housing development comprising of affordable small dwellings and bungalows in order to support both first-time buyers from the village and those residents who wish to downsize so as not to exacerbate current parking congestion within the village adequate parking should be a stated requirement in any development proposal | | | | | | | 2 | | | | |
| 83 | 2 | The issue as I see it is how do we maintain some level of control over such a development accepting that whatever preference we put forward in the neighbourhood development plan there is no certainty that over time these will not be upturned the rationale behind my choice of option is therefor which of the two tabled options is likely to prove the most influential. the options are | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 83 | 3 | Nominate a specific site in doing so we will have clarified a preference and define the scope of what is acceptable to the village our focus and efforts going forward can then be effectively deployed in containing any future expansion to within this defined Boundry | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | d on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 83 | 4 | We do not commit to a site preference the outcome will be that ad hoc planning application when prevented will need to be independently assessed on the individual merits the absence of a site specific plan increases the risk of some planning requests which we have rejected become overturned this in turn will result in unplanned ad hoc development which will inevitability drive us down the route of having to nominate a specific site in an attempt to contain the development | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 83 | 5 | My preference is therefore to nominate a specific site sized to, accommodate a maximum of 10 dwellings of the two locations earmarked for such development my preference would be to Braunstone Lane option. | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 83 | 6 | The extent of the current traffic congestion around the school constitutes a serious hazard additional development in this area can only exacerbate the situation i therefor believe it would not be prudent to progress this option the Parish Council in collaboration with the school should tackle the current issue and for our part we should not be looking to add further complications to the mix | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|---|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 | |
| 83 | 7 | Braunston Lane lends itself to the expansion of the existing road infrastructure should be able to accommodate such a small development a key requirement as stated earlier is the car parking provision is Incorporated so as not to adversely impact the village as Braunstone Lane and home close are brick built it would not be necessary to incur the additional expense of building in stone and not contain the purchase price of the dwelling to make them affordable a further consideration with this option is to assess whether The existing Sewerage infrastructure is sufficient to cater for the increased load | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 83 | 8 | Last but not least may I extend my thanks and appreciation to the neighbourhood development plan committee for their hard work and professionalism in getting this important initiative to its current state from the tone of last weeks evening it was apparent that this has been a difficult journey but you continued tenacity will ultimately prevail | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 84 | 1 | The information we have heard and seen in relation to the above is rather confusing. However, we are in favour | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | |
| 84 | 2 | of not specifying any sites at all within the development plan rather than commit the village to early | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 84 | 3 | development which is not necessary to fulfil DDC's rural housing quota. We recognise a general need nationwide | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 84 | 4 | for affordable housing but the building plans submitted do not address this issue | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |

| | | Analysis of Feedb | ack respo | nses fro | m consul | tation e | vent held | d on the | 18 th Nove | ember 20 | 17 | | |
|-----|------------|--|-----------|----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | | 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 25% | | 24% | | 24% | | 20% | | 81 | | |
| | | Total Response rate per policy item against 2011 census of a population of 384 | | | | | | | | | 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% | |
| | 1 | 6 | 14.6 | 00/ | 1 00 | 00/ | 0.0 | 00/ | 45 | 000/ | | 10/ | |
| | 1 | Support | 11.0 | | + | 0% | 8.00 | | | 00% | | 9% | |
| | | Object | 14.0 | | | 00% | 15.0 | | _ | 00% | | 2% | |
| | | Not expressed a view | 75.0 | 75.00% | | 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