

Section Page Reference	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
P42 - Transport- T1	<p>"Totally in agreement regarding HGV, these are a blight on the town. I have no problems with deliveries but the majority of these vehicles are foreign or heavy tipper trucks using Potton as a rat run to major roads or the quarry.</p> <p>These vehicles totally ignore the signs for HGV restrictive roads and contribute heavily to air pollution.</p> <p>Speeding cars are also a problem, just recently someone was knocked down on the level crossing at the Royal Oak.</p> <p>As the majority of vehicles go through Potton into Sandy and with Sandy recently found to have higher pollution levels than London. I do not believe Potton would be any different if tested which is a great concern.</p> <p>I would like to see diversions made, a stricter policy on HGV's with fines and average & gatso speed cameras installed through out the town. These would also have the benefit of raising money for the parish council."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Traffic issues are without the scope or control of the Plan and are a Central Bedfordshire Council Highways responsibility.</p>
6	I recommend that Potton Apple day reads Potton Allpe Day	The Plan will be amended

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
6	Sorry I recommend that Potton Apple day reads Potton Apple Day!	The Plan will be amended
14	<p>"Principle should read principal.</p> <p>My two comments to date are not meant to be critical, merely trying to help you produce the perfect document.</p> <p>The Plan is exceptionally well constructed and presented and makes a very good read. Everybody associated with its design and production deserve high praise.</p> <p>We are new to Potton and were particularly attracted by its many tangibly good points and an indefinable ""good feeling"" about the town.</p> <p>The aims and values of the Council reflect that good feeling and if aspirations are fulfilled Potton will be a wonderful place to live for many years to come.</p> <p>The Council will have its detractors over aspects, even minutiae, of the plan but for what it is worth I will not be one of them.</p> <p>Thank you for all the Council do in trying to make Potton an even better place to live. David Tall"</p>	Comments noted, plan will be corrected.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"Good plan hopefully will allow the Town Council's comments more weight when CBC consider developments not already on sites identified within the call for sites as amended through the local plan.</p> <p>One concern is that I believe Kier's are not intending to develop small business units (mentioned in initial outline planning application) or a business centre as suggested in the Neighbourhood Plan. I feel the Town Council should ensure that Kier's stand by their commitment for business facilities."</p>	<p>Once the Plan is ratified and adopted by Central Bedfordshire Council, it becomes a statutory document which has to be considered by both developers and Central Bedfordshire Council.</p>
Page 3	<p>"The credit for my work should be on page 3 of the document. This could simply read "" Spread Your Wings, a Sculpture by local Artist Paul Pibworth www.paulpibworth.co.uk</p> <p>In addition page 4 has the mosaic from Oliver (can't remember is full name)."</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
various	<p>"Firstly, I would like to congratulate the team of volunteers and other stakeholders who have worked so diligently on this draft plan; a comprehensive and authoritative piece of work which I hope will become a valuable asset for our community. I wish to share three brief observations/suggestions:</p> <p>1 - I have a slight concern about the current tone of language around London (and other) commuters who live in the town. In a few sections, the tone of the document creates an artificial division between those who do and those who do not commute longer distances to work. In the extreme, this may be interpreted as the Neighbourhood Plan being written only to serve the needs of the latter group. This is problematic for two reasons. (1) Many families, such as my own have deep routes in the area across generations and decades. It happens that one of us is a London commuter, employment having demanded so in more recent years, but we still feel deeply embedded within the community, (2) perhaps of greater concern, there is the risk of enshrining a 'them and us' mentality in the town between people who have lived here longer and those who commute and, especially, have moved into some of the newer housing developments. I feel the plan could do more to speak impartially to all sections of our community, of whom the latter group need to become an important and active part - both in terms of creating sustainable growth and ensuring public services are fit and diverse enough for an enlarged population.</p> <p>2 - I believe the plan could be enhanced with more explicit explanations of how improvements to public transport and, e.g. cycle routes, could and should link to networks beyond the town. For example, there is reference to a new cycle route to Gamlingay, but this proposal lacks context or rationale. Conversely, the importance of developing and maintaining off-road user friendly cycle and footpaths to Sandy or Biggleswade is less explicit but</p>	<p>The Action plan for policy EI-1 will address the issues of public transport.</p> <p>The creation of a Potton Green Wheel will address linkage within the Neighbourhood Plan area. The action plan for policy EV-4 will explore opportunities to create cycle links with surrounding towns and villages.</p> <p>The action plan for policy T-3 will address public transport issues.</p> <p>1. There was no intention to create an artificial division between those who do and those who do not commute longer distances to work. Surprisingly the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire results found that relatively few Potton residents commute to London. However their needs must be taken into account.</p> <p>2. There is more detail on cycle routes within the now published Green Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>3. Thank you for your support in identifying typing and syntax errors.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>where, for example, reference could be made to the wider regional connections this would offer through the National Cycle Network or Biggleswade Green Wheel. Similarly, I wonder if some kind of minimum standard for bus connections could be expressed, again with the rationale for connections to other towns and wider access networks.</p> <p>3 - whilst accepting the document is in draft form, one can't help noticing a number of typing and syntax errors, so one assumes this will be addressed in final drafting so as to preserve the credibility of the 'finished product'.</p> <p>I hope this is constructive and thank you again to all involved."</p>	
01-Jan	Yes to this opt in request and give your consent.	Comment noted with thanks.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Most!	<p>"A plan like this is essential if key areas like housing development, maintenance of roads and parking and provision of adequate support facilities such as doctors and to a lesser extent car parking around the central area are to be properly and professionally managed. Potton currently seems to be the bolt hole for many (or any) property development applications and this has to be controlled. It is not a competition to see how many people can make lots of money by selling land for development."</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. With regard to housing development, once the Plan is ratified and adopted by Central Bedfordshire Council, it becomes a statutory document which has to be considered by both developers and Central Bedfordshire Council.</p>
	<p>For me the Potton Neighbourhood Plan is spot on and has the best interests of the community at its foundations and on the whole reflects my own thoughts and gets my full support. I congratulate all involved for the good work put in to the project</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"Affordable housing is really important to me. I'm in the process of trying to save a deposit for one of the government schemes. One bedroom homes is what I am looking for.</p> <p>I think it will bring some energy to Potton."</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Policies HO-4 and HO-7 are designed to address this issue.</p>
14	<p>The chicken farm is east of Potton not west?</p>	<p>Comment noted the plan will be corrected.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
38	What is a rural exception site and what is its significance?	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines rural exception sites as:</p> <p><i>Small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. Small numbers of market homes may be allowed at the local authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding.</i></p>
43	<p>While the need for Public Transport is mentioned in various policies and visions, I feel that we should be far more assertive as to the needs of Potton- smart (ticketing between modes, time tabling ,good real time information), frequent and for most of the day and at weekends and integrated Public Transport. As the town grows this need will increase fast. An ageing population will also put pressure on provision. The increasing concern over pollution and air quality in particular will also lead to individuals seeking more environmentally kinder forms of transport than the car. A separate and clear section on Public Transport is in my view needed.</p>	<p>You raise an important issue regarding Public transport, which for Potton is mainly focused on Bus services. Since the bus providers are private companies it is difficult to see what can be done today to help as this outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan. However, your comment will be kept in mind for future evolution of the Neighbourhood plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
C1-1,2,3,4,6,8	<p>"I agree with you aims with regards these particular aspects of our Community. The Health Services are an essential part of the Town and need further investment to cope, with not only, the current population but new residents that will come with the current new houses being built along Biggleswade and Sandy Roads.</p> <p>The Schools, whilst not currently full, are increasing year on year and are under continual strain as they are funded in arrears and have little or no reserves to fall back on."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
HO - 1,2,3,4,5,6,9	<p>"I am in agreement with the need for strong controls over all the above mentioned facets of the new Housing that we will at some stage have to accept. We must retain the character of our Market Town and resist it being diluted by new style designs which make some new Estates look like identikit models.</p> <p>I think that trying to control an even build rate will be very difficult to achieve as I see the current explosion in new builds to continue until CBC and Developers alike have some respect for our Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is critical to have more genuine starter homes for our children who do not wish to move away from Pottton once they have decided to leave the family home.</p> <p>Variation in plans must also be controlled as we have already seen Kier change the plans along Biggleswade Road with the result that there is no longer any Industrial provision hence increasing commuter traffic at the same time."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We agree. The current attempts by Kier to designate site 6 as housing development is being resisted by Pottton Town Council in support of the Neighbourhood Plan which only supports the development of site 6 for employment use.</p> <p>This build rate aspiration is supported by National Planning policy and we believe this is achievable.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
E1- 1,2,3,5,6	<p>"It is vital to increase local employment opportunities, which none of the recent application has made any provision for. This is a key way of reducing commuting.</p> <p>However parking continues to be a key issue as people seem to consider walking as a last resort. I see few of our local businesses benefitting from the new houses due to that but also as shopping habits change and we all buy on-line more and more.</p> <p>No one will be encouraged to shop in the Market Square unless more parking can be provided or cycling made safer, which I see as almost a bigger problem as parking."</p>	Comments noted.
T1 - 1,2,3	<p>"I agree that we need to address the traffic issues. I think our road have been made more dangerous recently with the stupid changes outside The Royal Oak as a prime example.</p> <p>Unless people are provided with a safe and efficient alternative to using the car it will only get worse. Neither the Government or CBC are helping as bus services are continually under review, timetables reduced and heavy constraints are likely to be placed on Volunteer Bus Services."</p>	Comments noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
EV-3,5	<p>"I am concerned that CBC, despite saying in their plan that they wish to protect the Greensand Ridge, seem to place little or no value on it when dealing with recent planning applications. The habitants of this area may be small insects and plant but they are vital to keep the wildlife balance and should not be ripped up in the current building frenzy.</p> <p>I agree with your vision of enhancing and protecting our heritage and hope that when Developers state that they are adding to the environment that there is some way to check that what they produce actual delivers the benefits they claim."</p>	<p>The detail in Design guide is very stringent. It is the responsibility of Potton Town Council, Central Bedfordshire Council's ecologist and the Potton Community to ensure that they are referenced in comments to planning applications.</p> <p>The Government has indicated increased planning fees allegedly to fund more resource in LA's to ensure things delivered on the ground.</p>
	<p>Sorry, but this is too little, too late in helping to "shape and guide how housing and infrastructure development take place"! With all the houses currently being built, where are the plans to increase the size of the medical practice???</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Plan aims to control the amount and rate of development to allow all infrastructure to keep pace with the development.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>It's obvious to me that "money talks", and that the wishes of the community take second place, particularly in respect of housing development.in the town, so no amount of fine words in a Neighbourhood Plan will have much affect on CBS's decision making. Our excellent INDEPENDENT councillor Adam Zerny does his best, but unfortunately the cards are stacked against him...</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. With regard to housing development, once the Plan is ratified and adopted by Central Bedfordshire Council, it becomes a statutory document which has to be considered by both developers and Central Bedfordshire Council.</p>
52 Summary	<p>The Green Infrastructure Design ought to take into account a recent judgement regarding urban forests and the requirement for developers to plant enough trees so that their canopies cover at least 25 per cent of the land on any new estate.</p>	<p>This is addressed in the neighbourhood plan design codes.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
PAGE 24	<p>"Aspirations 26 and 28 refer to 'manage access to Deepdale Quarry' and 'manage area east of Sutton Mill Rd': these are both areas of private land, currently maintained by the various landowners at their own expense and effort and in what could be considered an aesthetic and eco-positive way. However, incorporation of these areas into any of your numerous long-winded plans will affect their future value as an asset, either as a pension fund or a benefit to be passed on to the landowners' children and dependants, by adversely affecting likely consent for development. This sort of potentially damaging 'aspiration' should have been directly discussed with the landowners before public consultation, as recommended by PPGIPAP elsewhere- not by relying on them happening across it buried in the plan.</p> <p>Further to the public access, will the landowners be expected to provide liability insurance or will PTC et al cover that?"</p>	<p>Comment noted. Green Infrastructure Plan and Neighbourhood Plan amended accordingly.</p>
P28 and others	<p>"Repeated references are made to encouraging commuters to use alternate transport methods - what are these alternate methods? The rail link to the main North/South line is long gone, the bus service is infrequent at best and uses 'dirty diesel' power and this is not California, it rains too often to expect the London-bound hordes to pedal to Sandy or Biggleswade. Potton needs better (more) car parking, not less."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The alternative transport methods were mainly envisaged to provide better facilities for cyclists including safe cycle routes.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
page 60	<p>""Once (surely you mean 'if?) this Neighbourhood Plan has been supported by the (small minority of) residents of Potton (who bother to respond) in a referendum and adopted by Central Bedfordshire Council, work will (may?) begin on making our Vision reality."" Rather presumptive, possibly even arrogant."</p>	<p>You are correct. It should read "if" the plan is supported.</p>
22 / 9 44/EV-2	<p>"It has been shown that trees and tree cover is something that improves the environment and has positive benefits on mental health. See https://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/eng-casefortrees.pdf/\$FILE/eng-casefortrees.pdf. Wycombe council are proposing that all new developments have 25% tree cover or other green features to help with environmental control, see article the abstract of the article in the Telegraph below, should we not be insisting on the same from any new developments? I suggest your policy EV-2. Could also reflect this.</p> <p>PLANNING Developers told they should plant 'urban forests' Council hopes to put green rivals in shade by using planning permission rules to increase tree quotas By Charles Hymas DEVELOPERS will be required to plant 'urban forests' that provide tree cover over a quarter of their new estates under pioneering plans. Wycombe council in the Chilterns is to become the first in Britain to require developers to plant enough trees so their canopies cover at least 25 per cent of the land on any new estate or risk being refused planning permission. If successful, it is seen as a model for councils nationwide. Planners chose 25 per cent because of research showing it is the 'tipping point' between being classed as a poor rather than a leafier prosperous neighbourhood, using multiple indices of social deprivation. The move also follows new research demonstrating the value of urban trees in combating pollution,</p>	<p>This is addressed in the neighbourhood plan design codes.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>reducing flood risk, cooling heat spots and improving biodiversity.</p> <p>The Wycombe plan is the brainchild of Philip Simpkin, the council's natural environment officer, who mapped tree canopy coverage in the borough against seven different indices of social deprivation including education and health.</p> <p>""Its not causative but a correlation [was found] where the areas that were the most deprived had the least canopy cover,"" said a spokesman. ""Trees are not the only things that can improve an area but they are a simple way of trying to improve developments.""</p> <p>To get planning permission, developers will be required to show how they will deliver at least 25 per cent tree canopy on new estates.</p> <p>In the densest developments where it might be more difficult to plant the required number of trees, the council will accept alternatives such as ""green"" walls and roofs covered with grass, plants and shrubs that provide the same ecological benefit as trees. David Johncock, Wycombe's cabinet member for planning, said: ""We hope that in the future this may become the gold standard which others will follow.""</p> <p>The proposal "" part of the council's strategic local plan"" is seen as a measure that could be included in the National Planning Policy Framework to help fulfil Defra's 25-year environment plan to plant 11 million more trees.</p> <p>New national guidance from the Tree and Design Action Group (TDAG), which brings together planners, tree experts and professional bodies, will recommend all councils set tree cover targets.</p> <p>The first map of tree cover in more than 280 cities and towns across Britain shows huge variation between the greenest (Farnham in Surrey with 45 per cent of its land covered by its tree canopy) and the lowest, which is Fleetwood in Lancs, at just 3.3 per cent.</p> <p>Kieron Diock, head of the Forestry Commission's urban forest research group, said: ""There's now such overwhelming evidence of the benefits of trees to people's health, physical or mental.""</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>I am from Caribbean heritage Living in Luton, I am always hearing other people complaining about the gypsies & Travelling community. I get ever so cross when I here other people from the settlers community keep talking about. the Irish Travellers. I think the Irish travelers get a raw deal, just Like the Caribbean community. Both the Irish & The Caribbean community, was always Being treated for years. Even in todays society 2018. Yours Sincerely. Miss Sharon Griffith.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>"I have put all comments on one form for ease of submission but have numbered my points:</p> <p>p.8 - This is a good comprehensive consultation that all have had an opportunity to input into and now comment on. Well done to all especially the volunteers that are not part of the Town Council. Good response rate.</p> <p>p.13 - Should this map show those sites already given planning permission eg Tall Trees development in the Zone C to give a true picture? At what date are the boundaries shown on this map been set?</p> <p>p.21 Vision D: Development of community projects - referenced Hall for All which I agree with. However, is shouldn't just be new development that supports projects such as the Hall and the cycleway and they can't be relied upon on their own to delivery key town facilities. How is the Town Council going to ensure these projects happen? It can't be left just to S106 or CIL payments and the goodwill of community groups.</p> <p>Should Hall for All be in Vision E under good leisure facilities? It is currently under Vision D infrastructure?</p> <p>p.24 Item 27 the new community space by the Hall project. Both here and in Vision G there should be mention of the footpath that was promised between the new Tall Trees development leading into Sheepwalk. This is vital in order to reduce use of cars and provide a short pedestrian route to</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan covers a 20-year period from 2016 to 2037. At the start of the development of the Plan, the Tall Trees development had not started construction and the building envelope is as shown in the map on Page 13. The houses in the Tall Trees development are considered to be new development which are included in the approved 'Medium Scale' development of up to 500 dwellings.</p> <p>P32 & 34 Ongoing actions will be coordinated through Potton Town Council and progress regularly communicated</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>the Town Centre for both the residents and those wishing to access the community orchard or greenspace. What update is there on this planned footpath and why isn't it in Vision G?</p> <p>p.29 - All of the projects noted in this section are good facilities for the Town and should be supported for funding and by the Town Council, In particular the need for a bigger more accessible community Hall (Hall for All) which has been an aspiration for the Town for many years.</p> <p>p.32 - CI-1 Vision a, d: Who is responsible for implementing and policing the policies? What are the active measures referred to in many of these visions? Does this just mean 'inform'. We know for instance that more GP provision can't be bought as such with more S106 monies. The Greensands Surgery has said that lack of GPs is not down to funding but inability to attract GPs here. So how will this vision be achieved?</p> <p>p.34 - CI-6: How will community projects to be supported as suggested at several points of the plan? This plan will obviously be a point in time but a transparent process needs to be put in place so that residents can see how projects can get supported."</p>	
(Paper)	<p>"1. I welcome the proposal to ensure that new housing developments are not ""identikit"" estates. 2. Not too happy with the general tenor of the plan as it seems to envisage a closely regimented environment. The beauty of Potton owes a lot to the piecemeal development of individual plots to many personal tastes. 3. Wholesale proliferation of cycle paths will not solve the parking problem. 4. Who will pay for more bus services? Existing services not fully used except mainly by holders of bus passes."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Plan is not trying to 'Regiment' the environment. Rather, it is trying to preserve the existing character of the town.</p> <p>The bus services are managed by Central Bedfordshire Council/private companies</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	We need a vision of how Potton can retain its character and not be dictated to by those who do not appreciate its qualities.	We believe that the Neighbourhood Plan addresses this point.
(paper)	Too many big estates being built. Easier permission should be for small groups of houses or barn conversions.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot stop development, but it seeks to ensure that all development is sustainable and limited to a maximum of 500 dwellings over the period of the plan. Smaller developments do generally get approval more easily. Planning process deals with individual cases.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(Potton Town Councilwebsite)	I would like to have a crossing of some sort in the market square opposite the newsagents. It is not very safe crossing this wide road especially for people with mobility problems. This will also help to slow the traffic through the square where the 20mph limit is still being disregarded.	Please contact Potton Town Council to raise the issue with Central Bedfordshire Council highways department.
(PTC website)	<p>"Survey highlighted desire for affordable, starter, bungalow etc homes for Potton. There appear to be none whatever that meet these criteria on the Biggleswade Road development. Certainly no 2 bed starter homes.</p> <p>Planning permissions should make far more requirements in line with desires of Potton rather than developers.</p> <p>All new street lighting should be mandatory solar powered, LED, low light pollution design. Solar power should be standard fit wherever possible on new developments.</p> <p>Developers are building ""little boxes made of ticky tacky and they all look just the same"" .</p> <p>There is ample opportunity with modern technology for prefabricated housing that would address the affordable housing and also be possible to moderately ""customise"" at small or no cost.</p> <p>A street in Buffalo, New York approaching park gates acted to maintain the character of the approach to the park. Identical cottage style houses were built , the ""road"" was made a footpath to the park. Buildings were individualised by having bay, shuttered whatever, different, windows, front doors, small porch, no porch. Vehicle access was via a road behind and below the houses with garages under the houses. The design is a triumph.</p> <p>Wouldn't it be good if we adopted some of that kind of thinking in Potton ."</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan, once ratified and adopted by CBC, will ensure a minimum of 30% affordable housing which is in line with the Central Bedfordshire Council Draft Local Plan. At present, developers are able to avoid this requirement if they can demonstrate that it is not economically viable for them to do so.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide will avoid these 'little boxes'.</p> <p>All technology is available for consideration provided it meets current Housing Standards legislation.</p> <p>See policy EV2 which addresses carbon reduction.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>Thank you to all those who have worked so hard over the last few years to put this together in such a pragmatic way. Whilst it is a shame that so many developments have been approved and will be developed, at least now there is a very firm line in the sand and rational reasons identified to control future developments and ensure that they are for the benefit of the community as well as providing housing.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
32 CI-1 CI-2	<p>""Any development shall take in to account the need for funding for expansion or creation of appropriate facilities and ensure appropriate funds are made available.""</p> <p>Support this intent but I think that if housing development is only in small parcels, the funding formula might mean proportionally smaller amounts of funding are released thus counteracting the intention. It may be better to have one larger site than several small ones if adequate funding for other facilities is to be released."</p>	<p>The wording of these policies is to be revised.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
34 CI-8	Very much in favour of increasing public footpaths, cycleways etc	Comments noted.
36 HO-2	<p>"I agree that this sounds sensible but providing new infrastructure such as healthcare or educational facilities is extremely expensive and so it may not be possible to do it incrementally in small amounts in line with small amounts of housing growth. As per a previous comment, in reality may need a larger amount of housing growth to actually finance any increase in facilities of this kind.</p> <p>Same comment applies to HO-8"</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that all future developments have the necessary supporting infrastructure. This means that the development should meet the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This is best achieved by having a uniform growth rate so that infrastructure development can keep pace with housing growth.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
37	Very supportive of all proposals on this page in particular ensuring that the needs of those who are vulnerable or on low incomes are met.	Comments noted.
40 EI-1	Strongly support focus on public and alternative modes of transport	Comments noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"Appendix A Site 6 is now in the Local Plan Appendix 4 where it is identified as a site that should be considered favourably for alternative (non employment) uses. This goes against the NP site assessment. I think that we should specify that any application for development of site 6 must include the provision for premises (business park) for small businesses."</p>	<p>We agree. The current attempts by Kier to designate site 6 as housing development is being resisted by Pottton Town Council in support of the Neighbourhood Plan which only supports the development of site 6 for employment use.</p>
	<p>I do not want anymore houses, I have grown up here in a lovely town and now it is becoming horrible. Too many houses making it feel crowded. Not enough services to share between us. Roads are much busier. It makes me not want to live here anymore as the countryside is being ruined by housing.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot stop development but it seeks to ensure that all development is sustainable and limited to a maximum of 500 dwellings over the period of the plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>Fantastic work. Particularly supportive regarding allocation of housing ie the sites the people of Potton do NOT want built on. We have had enough!</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"Representations to the Potton Neighbourhood Plan from Landscape Land and Property</p> <p>We are representing sites NLP347 (Site 14) and ALP 220 (Site 15)</p> <p>NLP347 passed the Central Beds 'Technical Assessment' of the 'Call for Sites' Comments from that assessment include:-</p> <p>The site is situated to the north west of Potton and can be seen as a logical extension, however the site is likely to be more suitable if approved with submissions to the north and south of the site.</p> <p>Would not result in the loss of services or impact sustainability</p> <p>No physical constraints</p> <p>Access is the key issue for this site however has little impact on any historic and unique character in this area but is very well formed to the settlement pattern.</p> <p>Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required</p> <p>This assessment made the site probably the 'best' site put forward in/around Potton. The Town Council agreed and it was your Council's favoured sites for development in Potton. In response to the draft CBC plan (Aug 2017) your response stated:-</p> <p>Within the constraints already highlighted early in this response to your draft Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan would support development on sites NLP170 and NLP347</p> <p>However, in sites' assessment section of the draft Neighbourhood it now states with regard to NLP347 (Site 14):-</p> <p>There is no vehicular access to this site and no obvious opportunity to provide such access</p> <p>This is clearly at odds with The Neighbourhood Plan's general assessment of the area North West</p>	<p>The site assessment has been refined during the plan consultation and development process and these sites have been assessed as not being supported at this time.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>of Potton, because it states quite clearly in the preamble to Site 13</p> <p>It is possible that this site could provide access to site 14</p> <p>Your own draft Neighbourhood Plan has identified a possible solution to the access which seems to completely contradict the 'no obvious opportunity' and this suggests to us that The Neighbourhood Plan is now 'looking for' reasons to exclude sites despite the clear statements in the Neighbourhood Plan in the Annex A site Assessment section:-</p> <p>An exercise was undertaken by the neighbourhood plan sub-committee to identify all the existing or potential development sites that were relevant for the period of the plan. Clearly there may be other small windfall sites that come forward during the plan period and these will be assessed using the same criteria at the relevant time by the Town Council. The sites identified comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sites identified by the CBC in the call for sites. -Sites that have previously been granted permission. -Sites that are currently being developed. -Sites that may fall within the category of windfall within the CBC Local Plan. <p>Local knowledge of the sites in question.</p> <p>Where potential sites exist there is a wealth of local knowledge relating to these that is not available to those who do not live within the community.</p> <p>Information on whether site rejection as part of CBC planning assessments.</p> <p>We believe that combining Sites 14 and 15 solves the access concerns and meet all the requirements of The Neighbourhood Plan and overcome any reservations of the Central Beds Call for Sites Assessment. Indeed it was suggested in the CBC technical assessment that this would be a solution and something highlighted in the NP sites' assessment, so all parties already agree on the solution.</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>The Town Council letter to Central Beds Council of Aug 2017 indicates clear support for Site 14 and indicates a lack of support for other sites, in particular ALP465, ALP199, ALP217.</p> <p>It also goes on to say:- The Neighbourhood Plan will support the inclusion of Rural Exception Sites within any future developments or sites that are to be included in the Local Plan process. Thus, NLP170 and NLP347, should include this provision for the inclusion of a Rural Exception Site.</p> <p>This statement is backed up and justified by the Potton housing need assessment.</p> <p>However now the NP is effectively not proposing any significant development in Potton for the entire life of the plan; this is presumably due to the view expressed that Potton has 'had enough development'. However, this view is add odds with recent planning application decisions and appeal decisions. For example, Appeal Decision APP/P0240/W/17/3176444 (known as CB/16/03943/OUT, 64 Biggleswade Rd) explains the following. The inspector states:-</p> <p>43. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area.</p> <p>51. With regard to concerns over increased traffic, clearly a development of up to 85 dwellings is likely to lead to some increase in traffic movements and associated factors such as noise. However, there is little evidence before me that the proposal would result in significant movement, even taking into account other nearby proposals. In such circumstances, I do not find that any increase in traffic would provide justification for the refusal of the proposal. I am reinforced in this finding by the fact that no objections have been raised by the local highways authority on this point.</p> <p>52. I note the concerns raised in respect of living conditions, and in particular on the occupants of dwellings along Biggleswade Road and The Ridgeway.</p> <p>54. Taking into consideration all other matters raised, I do not find that these, whether individually or cumulatively, amount to justification for the dismissal for the appeal.</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>66. For the avoidance of doubt, in the absence of any identified adverse impacts, I find that there is no justification for the dismissal of the appeal proposal. The wider public benefits in this case, which include assisting in meeting the unmet need of Luton (and the wider HMA) and the provision of market and affordable housing remain pertinent, and there is no justification in this case for withholding permission.</p> <p>Whilst these conclusions may be at odds with the stated wishes of the community and the findings of the local housing survey, they clearly suggest that Potton can accommodate the size and scale of development that has recently been approved either at appeal or by planning decisions and this strongly suggests that the 'targets' as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan for 'no more than 2735 dwellings' is arbitrary and unrealistic during the period 2018-2035 given that consents already exist for this number at present and that the Town Council objected to every single planning application of the 6 sites that are identified as 'already approved' in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>If you were to stick rigidly to the 2735 number then Potton would not grow at all during the entire life of the Neighbourhood Plan, which runs counter to the vision statement:</p> <p>-There will be a controlled, proportionate and uniform growth over the period of the Plan with sustainable developments that meet the needs of the town and its residents.</p> <p>It also turns out, when you read the comments from the Town Council for all the planning applications and/or appeals for sites A-F (that have all now been granted planning consent), that the Town Council objected to every single site. The objections consistently raise the issues of (lack of) infrastructure, traffic and sustainability related matters.</p> <p>Now, the Neighbourhood Plan is supporting these development sites, yet the one site that the Town Council has supported as suitable for development, the Neighbourhood Plan excludes on a inaccurate assessment. This approach runs counter to the indication in the Neighbourhood Plan that the site assessment exercise was comprehensive.</p> <p>The exclusion of Site 14, when one reads the reasons in the sites assessment, it amounts to a</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>restatement of CBC comments/conclusions on access, rather than the 'wealth of local knowledge' expressed to have been available in the Neighbourhood Plan sites assessment document. Very clearly, if a full assessment had been undertaken it would be obvious that access can be achieved and this 'reason' for exclusion could be overcome if the wealth of local knowledge was used properly.</p> <p>Conclusion We consider that when combined, sites 14 and 15 make a highly suitable development on the North Western side of Potton. This location was clearly supported by local people and The Town Council, as well as meeting the technical criteria outlined by Central Bedfordshire Council. Indeed the very solution to the access 'problem' was identified by both Central Beds Council and within The Neighbourhood Plan and as this is the only reason for excluding the site, it should be supported by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The two sites collectively could provide in the region of 60 houses and this should be a sensible development proposal for Potton during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan and better fits with the Vision Statement of uniform growth over the 20 year period. It would amount to around 3 houses per year over the life of the plan! To exclude the Town's preferred site, when so many other development sites are included in the plan, would run contrary to the vision statements objectives, as well as denying the residents of Potton what they have asked for.</p> <p>On this basis we object to the Neighbourhood Plan and ask that you revisit the site assessment process and include sites 14 and 15 as suitable development sites."</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
48-49	<p>"The 'supported sites' for residential are too small to provide the 500 dwellings the plan claims to provide.</p> <p>Site 6 is incorrectly drawn as this includes substantial amount of community land, including the Hall for All, Orchard, open space and play areas.</p> <p>Sites 1 and 2 should be included within the supported sites as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are close to the town centre and therefore sustainable -link the existing residential areas of Sutton Road, Bury Hill, & Hatley Road to the town - can be developed in an interesting and progressive way to include features other than residences, such as connecting footways to Henry Smith, The Scout Hut, The Causeway, provide municipal gardens or other community infrastructure and enhance the green infrastructure around the brook. - is sustainable at it consolidates development around the town centre. - with sensitive design are able to provide complementary development with a proper housing mix <p>."</p>	<p>The Plan allows for up to 500 new dwellings. Included in this allowance are all the sites which have already been approved including the Tall Trees site on Biggleswade Road.</p> <p>Noted. The boundaries of the sites are approximate only.</p> <p>Sites 1 and 2 have been thoroughly assessed in our site assessment document and found not to be suitable for development for the reasons stated in the plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Website	<p>"Objectives of the Potton Neighbourhood Plan (Comments in CAPS)</p> <p>Using the results of the public consultations and the pre-vision questionnaire, the steering group have identified the following objectives required to deliver the Vision for 2035:</p> <p>To SUPPORT, manage and control future growth in accordance with the Vision</p> <p>To have a comprehensive plan for A SUSTAINABLE MIX OF increased residential development which addresses current and future population requirements and is in conformity with the CBC Local Plan</p> <p>To encourage the development of small and medium sized businesses in Potton to promote local employment</p> <p>To ensure that the Community Infrastructure meets the needs of the Town and has the capacity to support future growth</p> <p>Leisure facilities will meet the needs of the whole Town INCLUDING FUTURE GROWTH AND EMERGING LEISURE NEEDS</p> <p>To maintain and improve Potton's Green Infrastructure, open spaces and its ecological environment to protect wildlife</p> <p>To develop a ""Green Wheel"" network of walks, footpaths and cycle-ways in Potton</p> <p>To ensure that future developments will link in with existing and future footpaths and cycle-ways to encourage pedestrians and cyclists with associated Environmental and Parking benefits</p> <p>To manage parking throughout the town"</p>	<p>This is related to the website which will be revised.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
13	Zone C should include the area bounded by The brook, Bury Hill, Sutton Road, The Scout Hut, & The Causeway as this is sensibly located close to the town, is ripe for sustainable development and consolidates the town envelope (as opposed to meandering peripheral development)	Zone C is defined as being the existing settlement envelope excluding the conservation area. The majority opinion (as determined via the Neighbourhood Plan consultations) does not support development of sites 1 & 2. Sites 1 and 2 have been thoroughly assess in our site assessment document and found not to be suitable for development for the reasons stated in the plan.
18/19	<p>"Comments in CAPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate growth that takes place close to the Market Square that supports local businesses and eases parking issues by encouraging pedestrian and cycle traffic. SITES 1 & 2 - Future housing development that occurs in the areas, identified in the site assessments contained in this plan and accepted as part of the local plan, as suitable and sustainable and acceptable to the town's population. - New housing developments which address the shortage of smaller sized affordable houses for first time buyers, young people in Potton living with their parents who want to move out and people whose children have left home, looking to downsize. SUPPORT - Development that addresses the identified shortage of properties (smaller houses/ bungalows) suitable for retired/older people. This will facilitate downsizing freeing up larger family sized houses thus reducing the need for larger houses on new developments. SUPPORT - Development of property that are designed to Lifetime Homes standards which are particularly suitable for frailer elderly people and also wheelchair-bound residents. SUPPORT - Development that ADDRESSES paucity of genuinely the affordable housing as indicated by over 50% of respondents to the Housing Needs Survey which showed that they or someone in their household was either considering affordable rent or shared ownership due to lack of financial means to purchase or rent on the open market. Such development may include development of Rural Exception Housing in line with the Housing Needs Survey and Central Bedfordshire Council's current requirements. 	Sites 1 and 2 have been thoroughly assessed in our site assessment document and found not to be suitable for development for the reasons stated in the plan.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>Strategies that address the need identified by the Neighbourhood Plan survey to support out commuting by rail from Biggleswade and Sandy stations, through improvement of access to the wider public transport network for those in the parish and promotion of the development and use of alternative methods of travel other than private vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The growth in working from home by keeping up to date with communications technologies and encouraging service providers to give a good service level throughout the town. SUPPORT - Provision for people who come in to the Town to work through appropriate provision for parking and alternative transport." 	
20/21	<p>"Comments in CAPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure changes to Potton include provision for facilities or premises that enable businesses to be started and run within the Town. People who are currently working from home or running small home based businesses can instead use some form of common business facility or hub as shown in the community consultation. SUPPORT HOME BUSINESSES IN ANY CASE - Ensure that any development of the town supports the existing businesses in the town rather than encouraging use of local shopping centres in nearby towns. - Ensure that areas identified as reserved areas for future employment development or as designated Employment Areas are protected from housing development. NEED TO BE CAREFUL OF THIS. YORK HOUSE IS A 'BAD NEIGHBOUR' USE AND IS NOT APPROPRIATE IN ITS CURRENT LOCATION. BUSINESS USE MUST BE APPROPRIATE TO THE SURROUNDINGS AND EXISTING BUSINESSES 'PER SE' SHOULD NOT BE PROTECTED. - Support the improvement of communications technologies and encourage service providers to give a good service level throughout the town as a business enabler. HOME BUSINESSES WILL ALSO GENERATE TRAFFIC - POLICIES NEED TO BE AWARE AND RESPOND TO THIS - Ensure there is adequate provision for in-commuting employees of businesses based in Potton both for parking and alternative transport means. The scoping study showed that the majority people employed by Potton businesses with premises commute daily from outside of Potton. - Where appropriate help businesses move from potentially unsuitable locations to other locations that have been identified in the plan designated as suitable for light industrial use. AGREE SEE COMMENTS ABOVE" 	<p>The Plan aims to ensure that facilities appropriate to the surrounding dwellings are built in areas identified as reserved areas for future employment development or as designated Employment Areas are protected from housing development.</p>
21	<p>"COMMENTS IN CAPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensuring that any development FULLY ADDRESSES the need for funding for MAINTENANCE OR expansion or creation of appropriate healthcare and educational facilities and ensure appropriate funds are made available. - Ensuring proposals where appropriate promote the creation of small and medium sized businesses to enhance employment opportunities within the community. Where possible, 	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>proposals should include provision for facilities or premises that enable businesses to be started and run within the Town. This will include the ability for people to work from home, run small home based businesses or use some form of common business facility or hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensuring proposals support the existing businesses in the town rather than encouraging out-commuting to other local shopping centres in nearby towns, and easy safe use of nonvehicular travel to the town centre. - Ensuring that any development of the town includes provision for funds to further develop identified community projects or provides ongoing funding to cover the cost of maintaining existing community projects for the town's residents. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The upgrade and creation of cycleways linking Potton to Sandy and Gamlingay. - The building of the Potton Hall for All as a new multi-use, environmentally friendly community space for the Town to expand the leisure and sport opportunities available - SEE THIS AS OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE - Provision of good pre-school facilities. - Including strategies that address the need identified by the Neighbourhood Plan survey to support out commuting by rail from Biggleswade and Sandy stations, through improvement of access to the wider public transport network for those in the parish and promotion of the development and use of alternative methods of travel other than private vehicles. - Supporting the improvement of communications technologies and encourage service providers to give a good service level throughout the town as a business enabler. ALSO NEED TO CONSIDER PHYSICAL BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE - Supporting development proposals that alleviate existing congestion, improve pedestrian safety and improve traffic flows through Potton. <p>Proposals are viewed favourably and supported, notably where they divert HGV traffic away from the Market Square and King Street or help enforcement of traffic restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensuring support where proposals: maximise opportunities to walk and cycle within the town; provide segregated footpaths and cycleways from traffic; provide a safe footpath layout within the scheme and good pedestrian links to the settlement; offer safe connections to the highway and enable those particularly with special needs or more elderly members of the community easier access to the town centre facilities. - Supporting new developments that contribute towards improvements in private, public and community transport in the parish." 	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
22	<p>There is a consistent mistaken assumption within this vision statement that all Leisure facilities are outdoor. This is not the case,. There is a compelling need for indoor or linked indoor-outdoor leisure spaces. There is every reason to include further support for the Hall for All within this Vision statement as providing this un-met need.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
25	<p>"A Promote the planting of trees within the town B Provide more benches on walking routes C Ensure existing allotment site is protected - STRONGLY SUPPORT D Adopt mowing regime on publicly owned grassland within town to maximise wildflowers and biodiversity interest E Create / retain wildlife corridors, especially those with locally distinct woody hedgerow species F Create a clearly marked circular route around Potton, staying off the roads G Create lizard habitat and hibernacula in appropriate locations throughout the parish H Seek CWS recognition for sites that meet the criteria (e.g. Carthagen Road / Biggleswade Road corridor"</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
38	HO-10. This Policy could stifle innovative design and restrict future good development. In particular, it is not required outside of the conservation area. It could also prevent future wanted development of a type not currently foreseen.	This policy is supportive of the strongly held belief that Potton should retain the character of a Georgian Market Town. This was reinforced by the public consultations. Normal planning rules would still apply, therefore innovative proposals could still be considered on their merits.
40	<p>"EI-2 Each new residence shall have a minimum of 2 parking spaces that meet Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide requirements. These are summarised in section 5.5 of the plan and expanded in Potton NP - Annex E Design Guide. (See EI-3)</p> <p>This is contradictory to other policies. On supporting non-car based transport and restricting parking. What about supporting car-pooling schemes or car share schemes. You can't please all of the people all of the time."</p>	The plan supports the provision of adequate parking provision for new dwellings. Alternative schemes lie outside the remit of the plan.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
41	<p>"EI-6 Proposals for the relocation of industry from unsuitable town locations to designated preferred locations will be supported.</p> <p>Thank you for including a picture of York House here. It shows exactly which industry is in an unsuitable location"</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>I am broadly in agreement with the neighbourhood plan. The aspirations detailed in there are in the right spirit to promote the development of Potton over the period of the plan and are all laudable. However, currently looking at the approved housing developments so far for the town, one would question how the plan will be implemented to stop more of the same and whether in places it is too late. We need to accept that controlled development of housing stock is essential. However, this development should be appropriate and reflect the local environment and requirements / increases in needs that such development brings (i.e. health, education, transport infrastructure) We need properly affordable accommodation to be built alongside bigger properties. However, why do we need to accept the same low standard, non innovative housing developments? If we accept that development is necessary then let us have something that is more than a "bog standard" Wimpey Estate. Let's consider the challenges of the future and consider environmentally sustainable developments, from properly energy efficient houses, innovative waste management systems (http://www.nwcambbridge.co.uk/vision/sustainability/waste-management). Allow developers to build houses, but don't give them free rein, and if they change plans without consultation, make sure there are meaningful punitive consequences. Prescribe minimum energy standards, remember we are building new houses for our community, its future, and not purely to make a profit for the landowners and developers. Build houses that will last and that have an eye on the future and that make Potton a place people really want to live in rather somewhere a bit more affordable than some of the other places around here. With regards to businesses with town it would be desirable that we do all we can to retain and promote their development. If planning or financial incentives can be used to prevent town central commercial properties from being re-developed into purely residential then we should endeavour to do all we can to support this. A town is more than just some where to live, if we want a vibrant community we need a diversity. Finally while doing this development we should continue do all we can to respect the green spaces and natural environment that make living around here so pleasant.</p>	<p>Comment noted with thanks. We expect that the Neighbourhood Plan when published will help to achieve your aspirations.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1/1, 6/5 etc.	<p>"1/1 I perceive the first paragraph to be incorrect. From my perspective, the aim of the neighbourhood plan is being put in place in order to limit damage to the area rather than to improve it. That aside, I appreciate that this exercise is desirable in the current setting. I also recognise the limited powers of the local town council to influence local developments.</p> <p>6/5 Why give approximate figures for people living in Potton when accurate figures should be available. This might best be visualised graphically, possibly on a logarithmic x-axis scale given the exponential nature of population growth.</p> <p>7/2 No mention of the gp surgery with the detail about doctor head-count and number of gp's (noting the share arrangement with Gamlingay). Also no mention about the ratio of doctor's head count versus population compared with other areas of the county.</p>	<p>Comments and corrections noted.</p> <p>We believe that the aims of the neighbourhood plan to ensure appropriate development are clearly stated on page 11.</p> <p>Management of Potton Brook is outside the remit and is the responsibility of the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Board to address.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>7/Photo: Should be updated to show current developments.</p> <p>8 We greatly appreciate the opportunities we have had to input to the plan, which we have done as much as possible (which has been admittedly inadequate).</p> <p>8/Consulting and Evidence gathering: I have great worries about the impartiality of the CBC and consequently for the use of their evidence reports given reports of their imbalanced requirements for developer contributions to infrastructure and also the imbalance in their imposition of house building across the region. In addition, I was extremely worried when I attended a meeting called by Alistair Burt with the head of the council and others when the head of CBC said he wasn't taking healthcare arrangements into account. I thought this a shameful state of affairs.</p> <p>Page 11: I like the vision. Major concerns for infrastructure are around healthcare, policing, youth support (education and leisure), community centres and public transport.</p> <p>Page 12: No links to the several supporting policies.</p> <p>Page 12/Para 2: Need to re-word slightly: This vision includes the need to ensure THAT expansion; I agree with the rest of the page.</p> <p>Page 14: I fully endorse the wording 'worthy of preservation'</p> <p>Page 15 or 16: I t might be worth mentioning the iconic image across the field from the Sutton Road/Wrestlingworth Road crossroads towards St Mary's church, which gives the town a strong identity and promotes its rural character.</p> <p>Page 18 para2: lose the comma: 'associated policies is regardless, of development' also remove commas from 2nd bullet.</p> <p>Page 19: I disagree with 'The plan aims to discourage this, for example if a number of bungalows have been built suitable accommodation for households with specific needs such as incapacity then a subsequent request to add another floor/convert the loft will not be supported as it reduces the availability of such housing for those who need it and wish to remain in community</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>rather than move away.' This can work both ways. (Also the wording could be clearer.)</p> <p>page 21 bullet 1 I have a concern that small developments currently underway around Potton avoid contribution to any infrastructure due to their small sizes - however many of these put together then result in unmet infrastructure needs. How is this to be addressed?</p> <p>page 21 main bullet 8: there is currently no provision for pedestrian safety in and around the market square. There has been no enforcement of the 20 mph speed limit (to my knowledge) and there are no crossing points with pedestrian right-of-way. This is a major and particular concern given we have a number of disabled people living in the community.</p> <p>page 25 - not sure if this is mentioned but it might be useful to have plans to manage Potton brook water flow - this has been affected in the past by up-stream water release resulting in rapid flows through the park area, which clearly could be dangerous to children and small animals (and probably adults too). I've also heard anecdotal evidence of contamination in Potton Brook resulting in disease to pets; furthermore during the summer, if the grass cutting in the park is not adequate, biting insects seem to thrive (presumably in part aided by the close proximity to water/stagnant mud). Given the spread of insect-borne disease world-wide (albeit not [yet] widespread in the UK), I believe the plan should look to ensure appropriate measures are taken to monitor and control this situation.</p> <p>...to be continued."</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Page 3	<p>We have read the Potton Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2035 and note the immense amount of work by the Committee preparing the Neighbourhood Plan. We can see what an important document it is and outlines visions, aims, policies and objectives. We are glad that the Potton Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan and become, with the Central Bedfordshire Council's Local Plan, the starting point for deciding where development should take place and the type and quality of that development. At the moment, in Potton, there are many hundreds of houses at the planning permission stage or being built now and when the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan are adopted this should put a stop to speculative development in Potton, which puts a strain on infrastructure, services and resources. We agree that Central Bedfordshire Council should use the Neighbourhood Plan to help it decide planning applications in the Plan area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Pages 22/23/24/26	<p>"We especially agree with 2 visions - Vision E - ""Ensuring that the Potton Green Infrastructure (GI) Plan produced and issued as part of the overall neighbourhood planning is given due consideration when any development is undertaken so that important existing natural, historic, cultural and landscape assets (including wildlife habitats), accessible green space and rights of way within the Parish of Potton are identified and the local environment to evolve, in the manner desired by the residents, for the benefit of present and future generations."" Also Vision F which maintains ""the rural nature of Potton and to enhance the Green Infrastructure, in turn protecting the local wildlife, the environment and preventing the continued fragmentation of habitat"" and on Page 24 - Aspirational GI Enhancements especially Ref 2, 4, 19 and 20 but believe on Page 26 the priority ranking should be higher for Aspiration 20."</p>	<p>Comments noted with thanks. The Green Infrastructure Plan is the result of the outcomes of two public consultative workshops. The ranking of aspiration 20 was made by residents attending the Green Infrastructure workshops.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
29	<p>We especially agree with "This next layer of growth for the town must create developments of quality which contribute to the character of the town and which provide local benefit. It must be more than an exercise in meeting housing supply 'numbers' . Also the inclusion of the excellent "Building for Life" document which is the industry standard quality assessment for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
32	<p>We agree with "CI-1 Any proposals must ensure associated provision is made for an increase in accessible public health services."</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
36	<p>"We agree with ""HO-2 All housing development over the plan period shall be achieved at an even rate and at no point exceed the Neighbourhood Plan design guide build rate per annum.""</p> <p>We agree with ""HO-3 Proposals shall not be supported on sites other than those which have been identified in this plan that are within the proposed settlement envelope. These are locations A, B, C, D, E, F, 8 & 13 as shown on map.""</p>	Support noted.
38	We agree with "HO-9 No change of permitted development will be allowed that results in the change of use from that which was originally planned."	Support noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
40	<p>"We agree with ""EI-2 Each new residence shall have a minimum of 2 parking spaces that meet Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide requirements.""</p> <p>We agree with ""EI-4 The implementation of advances in broadband and other communication technologies to maintain and enhance the opportunity for effective business and home communications will be actively supported.""</p>	Support noted.
45	<p>We agree with "EV-3 New development will not be permitted within identified Local Green Space or adjacent to those areas, where it will be deemed to have a negative impact on wildlife and the community. These are locations 4, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 as shown on map Figure 1 -" Green Infrastructure Map."</p>	Support noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
/contd	<p>"Page 28: Section g has not been developed - could cross reference the map and perhaps provide some wording around the importance of safe local pedestrian and cycle travel over the period of the plan.</p> <p>Vision statements: Who is responsible for ensuring each vision? How can the infrastructure needs be apportioned across multiple small developments over time?</p> <p>Vision statement: e.g. C1-7: wording 'where it is possible' means it need not be considered more easily than if it was a requirement.</p> <p>EI-3 No figure 2 in the document? Note that large warehousing would not be in keeping with the Potton character (IMO)</p> <p>EI-5 No consideration is given to parking for visitors and tourists? Restrictions on parking at TESCO's car park also seem harsh currently.</p> <p>T-1 Strong support for restriction of HGV traffic. Few can get round the corner at the top of Royston street without mounting the pavement and one has been seen damaging a house due to loading beyond the end of the vehicle (i.e. with the added potential of injury to pedestrians). Also strong support for enforcement of the 20 mph limit, which appears to be disregarded by many especially early morning and late at night.</p> <p>T-2 Safe pedestrian links should include safe crossing points in and around the market square - this might also help control the traffic speed.</p> <p>T-3 Strong support for good, reliable and timely bus service for commuting and day-time access to other local towns and amenities.</p> <p>T-4 Parking is a clear and worsening problem! Support the proposal as an optimisation, but even this might not be sufficient with more housing.</p> <p>General comments: It seems to be a well thought out, considered and supportable plan. (Of course, much will depend on implementation.)"</p>	<p>This is covered in detail in the Green Infrastructure Plan (Annex B to the main document).</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is owned by the residents of Potton and will be managed by Potton Town Council. Sub-committees will be formed to produce action plans.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Page 31	<p>A general point that, as is sadly too often the case, 'the environment' comes last on the list of policies. The Government in its recent 25 year environment plan has pledged an approach to land use that puts the environment first. I strongly support such an approach recognising that a quality environment is what we depend on for our health and well being. I would like to see this more strongly reflected in the PNP. The order of the policies would be a small but important step in this direction.</p>	<p>Comment noted with thanks, we believe that the green infrastructure section of the plan has a prominent position bearing in mind that for many people the issue of development is higher priority.</p>
HO1	<p>See comments submitted against policy EV2 earlier</p>	<p>The Housing Design Guide strongly encourages and supports energy efficiency in the design and construction of all future housing.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>" 1.1 These representations have been prepared by Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Hallam Land Management to the draft Potton Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2035. Hallam Land Management has an interest in Land North of Sandy Road, Potton and has submitted an outline planning application to Central Bedfordshire Council for a high quality scheme providing up to 170 dwellings. Land at Sandy Road can deliver a number of key benefits including much-needed affordable homes, extensive highways/gateway features into the town designed to reduce current speeds, substantial landscaping and green infrastructure along the site's edges providing a softer treatment when compared to the existing hard urban edge in this part of the town, as well as additional car parking for the cemetery.</p> <p>1.2 In support of the draft plan, the Town Council has undertaken a review of potential development sites in and around the Potton. In the existing and emerging Central Bedfordshire development plan, Potton is identified as a "Minor Service Centre" described as a "larger settlement with a good level of services." As such, it represents a sustainable location for new growth. A Site Assessment document is included in Annex A to the Plan. This document provides an analysis of Land North of Sandy Road. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that whilst there is no "tick box" list of evidence which should be submitted with a neighbourhood plan other than the prescribed documents, proportionate and robust evidence should accompany the plan in order support the choices made and the approach taken.</p> <p>1.3 The Site Assessments document forms part of that evidence, but its approach to site</p>	<p>All comments are noted. However, we believe that the Site Assessment is a robust document which has been refined during the Plan consultation process and we stand by the decision not to support these sites.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>assessment is not robust or proportionate in particular regard to the analysis of Land North of Sandy Road (Sites 9 and 10). It is stated that Land North of Sandy Road is “within the Local Plan Countryside Gap to prevent settlements from merging.” That is incorrect. Whilst such a designation is proposed in the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan, this has only just recently been submitted for examination and remains untested as well as being subject to objection. It is not accurate to suggest that this proposed designation has the force of policy behind it and cannot represent a robust reason for discounting the site.</p> <p>1.4 The analysis continues by observing that the site lies outside the settlement envelope. Whilst this is the case, the settlement envelopes in the existing development plan (the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2009) were not drawn with Central Bedfordshire's full Objectively Assessed Housing Need in mind and hence cannot not be regarded as determinative in the consideration of which sites to allocate. The location of a site outside of the settlement envelope does not mean that it is unsustainable or poorly-related to the existing settlement. Land North of Sandy Road is an unremarkable arable field which abuts existing high-density residential development and contains edge-of settlement landscape features meaning that it is more visually and functionally associated with the existing built-up area than the wider landscape beyond.</p> <p>1.5 The site assessment asserts that Land North of Sandy Road “does not present a logical extension to Potton and would considerably change the historical settlement pattern and</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>character of Potton.” This is not an objective appraisal as it does not cite any evidence. It reads as an objection to the current planning application whereas a more balanced appraisal is needed in order to ensure a robust evidence base.</p> <p>1.6 In terms of biodiversity, the site provides a very limited area of suitable habitat for reptiles with the remainder of the site providing negligible opportunities for reptiles. This is confirmed by Paragraph 4.61 of the Ecological Impact Assessment report dated December 2017, which was submitted in support of the current planning application. The draft plan's assessment references concerns about impact on mammals but is not specific. This is dealt with in paragraphs 4.35 to 4.51 (inclusive) of the Ecological Impact Assessment. The site was not considered to support significant numbers of any mammals. Whilst the site was considered to be of local importance for certain species of birds, impact in this regard is capable of mitigation as set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment.</p> <p>1.7 National planning policy (now set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 or NPPF) does not require that new development avoid all impacts on biodiversity, only that such impacts be minimised and net gains provided in biodiversity where possible. New development could significantly enhance the site's value for biodiversity through, for example, the restoration of heathland and acid grassland habitats whereas at present the site comprises a flat arable field of scarce ecological value. Whilst it is suggested that the site is designated as a “significant wildlife area” there are no records of any such designation. In any case the site-specific technical evidence</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>which is publicly available on Central Bedfordshire Council's planning register indicates that the site has negligible ecological value. Impact on this value can be clearly be mitigated as well as offset by net gains in biodiversity.</p> <p>1.8 The assessment expresses concern about adverse impact on “views and resultant amenity enjoyed by users of the local highway and footpath network.” There are, in fact, only a limited number of opportunities to view the site from the wider area owing to intervening topography, vegetation, and built form. The development would be visible along the paths to the north of the site, but this would be read against the context of the built-up edge of Potton and would be limited to localised sections with appropriate landscape mitigation. Limited views would be achieved from a section of Sandy Road but this is already influenced by a number of urban fringe elements including a small transport depot and a cemetery and would be read against the built-up area of the town.</p> <p>1.9 There would be no demonstrable adverse impact on the highway network resulting from development of the site. A safe and effective access can be achieved. This is illustrated in the technical documentation which accompanies the 2018 planning application and was confirmed by Central Bedfordshire Council as the Local Highway Authority as a consultee to the previous outline planning application on the site submitted under local planning authority reference CB/17/00296/OUT. There is no evidence to support the assertion that introduction of an access to Sandy Road from the site would be dangerous.</p> <p>1.10 It is noted that the Potton Green infrastructure Plan aspires to deliver the site for Green infrastructure incorporating accessible acid grassland. However, it is unlikely that this aspiration will be achieved without enabling development. The current outline planning application delivers a significant portion of the site (approximately 52%) as publicly accessible Green Infrastructure and the previous outline planning application, CB/17/00296/OUT, received the support of Central Bedfordshire Council's Green Infrastructure Officer who commented that “the proposals appear well designed, with the potential to deliver a net green infrastructure benefit” There is no consideration in the draft plan of how the aspirations of to achieve Green Infrastructure in the town can be viably delivered.</p> <p>1.11 In terms of the draft plan's policies on housing, Policy HO-2 states that all housing development over the plan period shall be achieved and an “even rate” and at no point exceed the Neighbourhood Plan design guide build rate per annum. Despite the wording of the draft policy text which suggests that this policy requirement is expanded on in the Design Guide (Annexe E), this information has not been included. In any case, the imposition of a policy requirement to control build rates is ultra vires and does not fall within the scope of the neighbourhood planning process. Section 38A(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that a “Neighbourhood Development Plan is a plan which contains policies in</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>relation to the development and use of land in whole or any part of a particular neighbourhood area” In other words, a neighbourhood plan must be a land use plan and the policies therein must clearly relate to land use.</p> <p>1.12 The supporting text states that the purpose of draft Policy HO-2 is to address pressure on infrastructure but does not provide further evidence nor does any part of the draft plan's evidence base. In order to for such a policy to be robustly justified, it needs to clearly identify where the infrastructure concerns lie and identify ways to address this through the plan. It needs to be recognised, however, that there are already well-established mechanisms in the planning system to address the impact of new development on infrastructure and Policy HO-2 goes beyond what is proportionate and necessary to achieve this and thus failing to plan positively for local development contrary to paragraph 16 of the NPPF. Therefore the draft policy cannot be considered to have regard to the NPPF or contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>"</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"1.13Draft Policy HO-3 sets out that proposals will not be supported on sites other than those which have been identified in the plan that are within the proposed settlement envelope. Draft policy HO-3 cannot be described as having regard to national policy, which contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, as the draft policy can only be read as a presumption against development where such development does not relate to one of the eight sites expressly allocated in the plan. Policy HO-3 similarly does not have regard to the strategic policies in the adopted or emerging development plans, which do in certain circumstances permit the principle of certain forms of development on unallocated sites outside of the settlement envelope including certain forms of residential development.</p> <p>1.14As set out above, the part of the evidence base that considers which sites to allocate is deficient in its assessment and therefore fails to robustly support the choices made or the approach taken. The choice to exclude Land North of Sandy Road is only supported by vague, generalised, and in some cases inaccurate assertions without any balanced or objective analysis that clearly sets out the planning reasons for why the site is unsuitable.</p> <p>1.15In addition to not being supported by the proper evidence, draft Policy HO-3 is not flexible or positive in how it is drafted or in its approach to new development. Its approach in this regard will be impractical for planning decision-makers to apply which would undermine the efficient operation of the planning system and obstruct the delivery of sustainable development. It also undermines some of the plan's own objectives such as the delivery of affordable housing. The</p>	<p>The baseline date for housing numbers is 2016. The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the development sites and types of dwellings which would be supported by local residents and also those which would not be supported. Of course, normal planning application and assessment rules would be applied to any additional proposal put forward.</p> <p>Policy HO3 will be clarified.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>draft plan only allocates one small site beyond those already committed, one that is likely to support only very limited or possibly no affordable provision.</p> <p>1.16In summary, it is considered that the above-referenced draft housing policies of the plan fail to meet the basic conditions as they do not contribute towards sustainable development and have failed to have regard to national planning policy. In addition, the draft policies are not supported by a robust or proportionate evidence base nor are they sufficiently flexible or positively-worded.</p> <p>1.17Draft Policy HO-2 which seeks to control build rates is ultra vires and should be removed from the draft plan entirely. Draft Policy HO-3 and the evidence which supports it needs to be reviewed so it supports the delivery of sustainable development and does not introduce a blanket restriction on development outside of allocated sites. The Site Assessment document needs to be re-visited and should be redrafted so it undertakes a focused, consistent, and objective review which has proper regard to the technical evidence available. In undertaking this exercise, it will be evident that Land North of Sandy Road is suitable for residential development, has no fundamental constraints, and has the potential to deliver the Town Council's ambitions for the area such as the provision of much-needed affordable housing and the introduction of green infrastructure in a location which is well-connected to the town.</p> <p>1.18Hallam would welcome the opportunity to engage further with the Town Council in order to work towards a positively-prepared plan which meets the basic conditions and contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development."</p>	
EV2	<p>"(Having issues with my server -tried to submit comments on this policy earlier but not clear whether these were successfully sent - please ignore this if they have been received). My point about this policy is it does not go far enough to encourage zero emission housing developments. I advocate that only zero emission developments should be supported. I know this is not Government policy but I think Potton and Bedfordshire more generally should be calling for higher standards. The design guide makes reference to targeting zero carbon emissions but this needs to be turned into practice. This comment is also relevant to policy HO1."</p>	<p>The Housing Design Guide strongly encourages and supports energy efficiency in the design and construction of all future housing.</p> <p>The build rate aspiration is supported by National Planning Policy and it is believed to be achievable.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
36	I support the adoption of a housing plan for the people of Pottton rather than the current CBC plan supporting the enrichment of developers.	Comment noted.
44	I support the implementation of this green infrastructure plan for Pottton.	Thank you for your support.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"I feel we always need more:</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>Bridle Paths</p> <p>Footpaths</p> <p>Cycle Paths."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Plan supports this.</p>
28,	Really welcome the intention to create a Potton Green Wheel	Thank you for your support.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
21	<p>The document refers to upgrading the Potton to Sandy cycleway. this is not yet complete - so this cannot be correct? welcome the plan to build a Potton to Gamlingway cycleway</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Potton to Sandy cycleway does exist.</p>
22	<p>"The document refers to ensuring that new developments address issues of climate change and sustainability through (amongst other things) the reduction of carbon emissions by using renewable and low carbon energy sources such as solar and wind power. I absolutely agree with this - but would also argue that we need to look at retrofitting existing developments (as that will make up the larger proportion of buildings in Potton). In the first instance, what can the Town Council do about fitting solar panels or using wind power to provide energy to its own buildings? Can it work with other businesses in town to encourage them to do the same? The Lower School already has solar panels fitted.</p> <p>As well as cutting carbon emissions, we also need to look at water use."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy EV2 has been clarified.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
24	Pleased to see commitments to improving the wildlife value of Pegnut Wood, along with more access trails	Thank you for your comments.
	There is no reference in the plan to encouraging local businesses or households to use less plastic. A few years ago there was an initiative in the town to reduce the use of plastic shopping bags, by providing every household with a designed cloth bag. Since then the government has of course also introduced a charge on plastic bags, which has really reduced the number of plastic bags used. Since Blue Planet 2 highlighted the impact of plastics on / in the oceans, public awareness of the issue has never been higher - and a number of companies are pledging to take action, e.g. to eliminate the use of plastic straws for example. Can PTC work with local businesses to do something similar?	This is a worthwhile sentiment, but it is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>I think its fantastic that the Town Council has drafted this Neighbourhood Plan, and whilst I have provided a number of comments, I am very supportive of the whole document and the ambitions outlined within it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>
	<p>"In general I support the plan. Ideally I don't want any further houses built in Potton as I feel the developments being built, and already given the green light to be built, have changed the feel of the town I love.</p> <p>Therefore, I strongly agree with the point about any builds should be in keeping with surrounding buildings as some of the new builds look horrendously out of place and estate like which is not in keeping with a Georgian town. I also strongly agree with at least 2 parking spaces per house as this would also help get away from the enclosed estate feel allowing the houses to ""breathe"" and ease the road congestion.</p> <p>The only comment I do wish to add is that I do agree provision for the elderly is vital but the provision of bungalows in my opinion is a requirement and one developers promise but then never deliver. One or two bedroom properties is too vague and is unlikely to materialise into a bungalow.</p> <p>I only hope CBC will now leave Potton alone and agree we already have had more than our share of houses."</p>	<p>Thank you for your support. Comments noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"I support the plan. My only concern relates to car parking in the Town. Whilst there is reference to the need for adequate and additional parking , this is going to become an increasing problem , I think this needs more emphasis . I appreciate this may also be an issue for Central Beds Council , but it will surely carry more weight with them , If it is highlighted in the Neighbourhood Plan. Good luck.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>
<p>Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>I welcome the plan content on green infrastructure and particularly the measures to improve wildlife and deliver biodiversity gain. There is one particular group that does not appear to be adequately catered for and that is responsible dog walkers. There is, in my view, a significant lack of safe places where you can exercise a dog off the lead and train the dog in an area where there will not be a potential conflict with horse riders, runners and cyclists. This is particularly the case on the west side of the town now that such activity has been prohibited on the Mill Lane recreation ground. I support the need to improve the football pitches and to expand the recreation ground but I feel that provision should also be included for responsible dog owners who want to exercise and train their dogs in a safe space without causing conflict with other users.</p>	<p>Comment noted with thanks, the aspirations in the Green Infrastructure Plan if achieved would help to improve facilities for dog walkers.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>"This is a really well thought out plan that if implemented should see Potton develop in such a way that it fulfils the needs of the current population and indeed the future population, our children and their children.</p> <p>In recent times, the whole town has been shocked by the relentless bombardment of plans for new build estates on what is mainly currently our open countryside, the areas that makes us a small market town surrounded by woods and meadows, or farmland. However, these plans from wealthy developers keep coming and if they were all allowed we would soon be a large urban sprawl with little pleasant countryside left. There is always the danger that Potton could eventually be linked directly with Biggleswade or Sandy.</p> <p>The developers come with their plans which do not appear to provide improved health facilities, leisure facilities or extra places in the local schools, all of which would be needed if all the plans were approved..</p> <p>Most of the proposed sites seem to show houses of 4 to 5 bedrooms which may be suitable for wealthy incomers but not for young people just starting out in married life who need affordable homes. These seem to be very thin on the ground and apparently they can be removed from plans at the wish of the developer.</p> <p>This Vision provides what Potton will need if it is to maintain it's current status but allowing for a reasonable amount of growth where spare land is available.</p> <p>I commend the Potton Neighbourhood Plan and sincerely hope it is accepted"</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
23-26	<p>"The green infrastructure plan has identified an area known as Pegnuts Wood as an "accessible site" in existing infrastructure. The site as shown on the associated diagrams (page 26, figure 1) is misleading to the general public and local residents as this woodland is not open access land and is not accessible in the general meaning.</p> <p>Public footpaths dissect the wood on the southern and north eastern sides and run along boundaries, but the main woodland has no public rights of way located through it. The area is private land that is managed as a woodland site. While improvements to the rights of way network are noted as aspirational in the plan, no discussions have been held with the landowners in this regard.</p> <p>We would therefore express concern that the plan is misleading as to the accessibility onto this private land to the general public. We request that the designation is amended to 'other green infrastructure' and not shown as accessible."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Plan and Neighbourhood Plan have been amended accordingly.</p>
(paper)	<p>Stop voting for Tories at national level, because the Tory-controlled local council will approve developments "in your backyard" backed by a Tory government that supports those proposals!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
49 (paper)	I support the Neighbourhood plan of NOT support more growth of Potton. Also support the "green" enhancements.	Comment noted.
(paper)	I am impressed by draft Neighbourhood plan. Considerable time and effort has obviously gone into its production with as far as I am able to see, consideration given to every possible area for concern. Thank you for your dedication to everyone involved.	Comment noted. Thank you for your support.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	I am in favour of the Neighbourhood plan as long as it's successful in stopping all the big proposed developments that threaten to destroy our pretty small town.	Comment noted.
(paper)	I do not support development of zones 7,9,10,16,17,18 & 19	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The site assessment also does not support these sites.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	<p>"Leave Potton a small market town!</p> <p>Potton does not need any more housing. Everyone is struggling to get doctors appointments, park anywhere and is totally fed-up with all the traffic that is increasing. Bury Hill should not have any development. The traffic is almost constant now, accidents happen at the crossroads, no one respects that people actually live in this area and speeding is a huge issue. I moved to Potton 33 years ago and used to enjoy tacking my horse out, having to use the roads to get to bridleways. Now I struggle, no one has time for your horses and treat me as if I am in the wrong. Lots of near misses have occurred and it's putting me off going out for a ride after 57 years of riding!"</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Plan seeks to preserve the rural nature of the town which should address your concerns.</p>
(paper)	<p>King St residents disappointed by lack of action dealing with this busy road. Been to the various meetings but seems to be a waste of time with excuses. i.e. money, road classification etc. Poorly let down by council. Anti social behaviour getting worse. A Police patrol now and then would be a deterrent. New builds not a problem as long as we have more Doctors, Schools etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Traffic policies exist within the plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	We need to proactively engage with CBC and developers to get the right houses built and the right locations chosen. More green infrastructure and better path network.	Thank you for your comments which support our plan.
(paper)	I support the plan. Regarding transport and roads town needs speed tables and traffic calming urgently as town grows.	Thank you for your support. Comments noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	The plan could usefully say more on the quality of access to developments. i.e. to address another Mill Lane arising. Provision has been made for extending the Mill Lane Rec. Could provision be made for extending the Everton Rd allotments too? This would help protect the North-west of Potton from over development.	Comments noted. This is in the area of responsibility of the planning authority.
P21 (paper)	I support the upgrade and creation of cycle-ways. The above I think as a priority e.g. getting the old railway bed open to Sandy. Thus commuters and bird watchers would benefit.	Thank you for your support.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	Developers have won again. With all the new housing / people coming to Pottton the bus service has not been improved but cut! You only hear comments you agree with.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>We are looking for support for the plan which addresses many of these concerns.</p>
(paper)	The plan for 2018-2035 is not acceptable on any level. Pottton cannot cope the infrastructure is failing now. There is no chance with the proposed amounts of population for it to cope. Parking is a nightmare, people parking on double yellows, nothing is policed we have had 2 vehicles vandalised. Doctors can't cope. This whole thing that's going on now is the ruination of Pottton. The proposal will make everything 100 times worse.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Vision seeks to influence how Pottton develops over the period 2016-2031. It cannot reverse planning decisions prior to endorsement of the plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
(paper)	I support the Neighbourhood plan generally. We need controls and objectives to build our future on and to stem all the current speculative planning applications.	Thank you for your support.
page49 (paper)	The Development sites plan fails to identify and recognise land at Brookfields with an extant detailed planning permission. (LPA Ref: MB/09/00524/FUL dated 10/06/2009) for the erection of 6 detached dwellings. The land in question is shown shaded (more or less) pink on the attached copy extract from the NP sites plan but more particularly edged red on the attached copy site layout plan. D.H. Barford Property Director Wyboston Lakes Ltd.	As a small site of less than 10 properties we were not aware of this. However, it will be added to the site assessment and is likely to be supported.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
All (paper)	It is not clear what the legal status of the local plan is. Do CBC have to follow, take note, ignore? How enforceable is the plan?	Once adopted by Potton residents in a referendum, the Neighbourhood Plan becomes a statutory document that must be considered when planning applications are assessed by Central Bedfordshire Council. Therefore developers should refer to the Plan prior to application.
34 (paper)	"C1-5 Surely people can walk more than 500m C1-6 but not projects for sake of projects such as those for Tall Trees. C1-7 future provision for ALL. not just old or young or middle."	Comment noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
36 to 38 (paper)	"HO-4 should include down sizers in heading HO1,2,3,4,8,10 please tell CBC-they ignore all these"	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is covered in the objectives.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
44 (paper)	<p>"EV2 ?BREEAM Should start with measures to mitigate climate change. As it stands this paragraph is too accepting e.g. solar panals compulsory on all new developments. The bullet points do not tie in with the policy statement."</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy EV2 has been clarified.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
45 (paper)	EV-3 Please tell CBC	Comment noted.
47 (paper)	Councils are experts at ignoring local views.	Comment noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
6 (paper)	<p>"1. Everton Heath Greensand ridge landscape character area. Part of the GREENSAND ridge National Character area - not greensands. 2. Main area has been DESIGNATED as a conservation area."</p>	<p>Comment noted. Document will be revised.</p>
8	<p>Spelling at bottom 2nd column. THEIR vision.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Document will be revised.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
11 item d (paper)	develops rather than RETAINS	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Document will be revised.</p>
14 (paper)	poultry farms to East of town.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Document will be revised.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
16 3rd 5th (paper)	<p>"Green spaces 30% lost. Is there evidence, is it definite or planned? If so can it be reversed / influenced? Views also towards Sutton and Golf course. Although new and planned developments influence the views."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
17 (paper)	Need to include all the shops in the list. Gift, flowers.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The list will be revised.</p>
18 (paper)	It is inevitable that given estate developments by regional and national house builders that the houses will inevitably look the same.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The housing design guide seeks to address this issue.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
19 para 1 (paper)	<p>"Should the plan be supporting commuting out of the town by rail or road. Surely this will lead to higher prices, larger houses and potentially less reliance on Potton shops. Shows misguided policy of selling off housing association stock and not replacing them."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>However, the policy reflects public aspirations and opinions expressed in the questionnaire.</p>
21 bul 1,3 (paper)	<p>"1. Not happened so far. Have you tried to get a doctors appointment in less than 10 days? 2. Are you supporting commuting or not? Are you supporting local buses before they disappear completely? CBC is clearly not supporting access to local transport. Get HGV's away from town centre."</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Yes we are supporting commuting</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
22 last para (paper)	"Do new houses have to have reduced emissions, energy efficiency methods, solar panels, reduced water use etc. ? NO - must change now."	This is covered in the housing design guide.
28 (paper)	The development of a green cycle path with spokes must not create a "road" round Potton leading to a racetrack to the detriment of pedestrians.	Comment noted.

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
32 (paper)	<p>"C1-1 Ignored by current developments</p> <p>C1-2 Recent development proposals over optimistic over people walking to centre and existence of pavements.</p> <p>C1-4 Because bus travel not convenient inevitably people travel to shops e.g. supermarkets in Biggleswade, Sandy and A1 retail park by car."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The policies have been revised.</p>
(via comments email on NP website)	<p>" I am sorry for not responding sooner as I read the plan when it was first published. The reason for the delay was that I wanted to pay attention to the detail and I recognise that a great deal of effort and detail has gone into the preparation of the plan. All those involved should be congratulated for such a thorough job and I do not seek to pick holes in it (I am sure there will be plenty who will do so).My only observation is the relatively low profile of the comment about supporting developments that would discourage traffic flow on King Street and the Market Square but I would have liked to have seen a stronger position, to actively seek opportunities to deter and redirect traffic or to make Potton easier to navigate through. Any casual observer will see that the 20 mile per hour speed limit has achieved nothing as the speeders still speed in the absence of physical obstructions to their progress. Likewise, bullying and incompetent drivers cause all sorts of congestion that impedes the progress of those who try to be law abiding. Therefore it appears that King Street has once again been added to the ""too difficult"" pile and will await something serious to happen before it will get attention."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Planning Prospects Potton NP Reg: Original PDF file received by email on 18/06/2018 @ 11:19 and Document divided in to separate comments and put in to table for response:</p>		

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Vision B	<p>Planning Prospects suggest that Vision B of the Plan could be worded much more positively in support of sustainable developments that meet the needs of the town and its residents. Use of the words “controlled” and “uniform growth” currently suggest a restrictive approach contrary to the positive approach advocated in the Framework. We welcome that the plan is seeking to meet the needs of the town and its residents, but Planning Prospects suggest that an assessment of this need is undertaken to support the plan. Without this assessment it is not clear about the basis for determining the level of site allocations needed to deliver the Plan’s vision.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is not the intention of the Plan in any way to avoid sustainable growth of housing in the Parish. These words which we have used, 'controlled, proportionate and uniform' have been used so that it can be seen that we have listened to the concerns of residents as have been expressed in a town-wide questionnaire and other direct residents' involvements during the course of the Plan preparation.</p>
Policy HO-1	<p>This policy states that any proposal must adhere to the neighbourhood plan design guide requirements. Planning Prospects object to the use of the term ‘adhere’ and suggest that whilst the design guide should be a consideration for any proposal there should be no requirement for a proposal to strictly adhere to fixed requirements.</p> <p>Having considered the draft design guide accompanying the current consultation, Planning Prospects suggest that many of the key themes are incumbent of good design and sustainable development. Planning Prospects question the necessity of such a document and suggest that a policy setting out the expectations of good design may be a more appropriate policy response.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Plan sets out to provide a clear guide to future developments which should set out to use the guide as a benchmark as to the standard of quality which it would like to see implemented throughout.</p> <p>The Plan seeks to avoid many currently constructed developments' poorly designed housing, and thus by only 'expecting' good design we could see something quite different.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-2	<p>This policy seeks to introduce a phased approach to housing development, with development coming forward at an even rate and at no point exceeding the build rate per annum set out in the design guide. There are a number of sites around Pottton with planning consent and so it is therefore unclear how this policy could be implemented.</p> <p>The introduction of a phased approach is contrary to the objectives of the Framework which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. An otherwise sustainable development proposal should not be delayed from coming forward unnecessarily and without being justified by evidence. Noting concerns regarding pressure on infrastructure, necessary infrastructure improvements would be dealt with by developer contributions to support a scheme with the improvements delivered in a timely manner by the relevant infrastructure provider. Delivery of the improvements is beyond the control of a developer and this should not be used as a reason to delay sustainable development from coming forward.</p> <p>Further, noting the reference that the build out rate is expanded upon in the design guide, Planning Prospects have not been able to find this figure. To support a positive approach to planning in Pottton we suggest that this policy is removed from the PNP.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Plan will not be restricting the build rate to certain rate per annum.</p> <p>It cannot be accepted that by introducing a phased approach to the supply of housing this will affect the whole supply of housing numbers. It is not our intention to restrict the developments, only to avoid the number of units appearing to overwhelm the supporting infrastructure. It is accepted that developer contributions will used to facilitate improvements to infrastructure but unless the phasing of numbers is agreed at the outset no settlement of the infrastructure funding can be finalized nor guaranteed.</p> <p>The build rate aspiration is supported by National Planning Policy and it is believed to be achievable.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-3	<p>This policy states that proposals will not be supported on sites other than those identified in the PNP. We suggest that only allowing development on the supported sites, those already approved and the two additional small scale developments in the settlement envelope is an overly restrictive approach.</p> <p>The PNP is progressing at time when the full housing needs in the Local Plan have not yet been determined, there are currently have significant objections to the proposed housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan as set out in more detail above. As such we suggest much greater flexibility will need to be drafted in to this policy to allow consideration for further development proposals during the plan period, should the housing requirement increase through the Local Plan examination.</p> <p>The need for flexibility is further demonstrated by the lack of a local assessment of housing needs to determine the level of housing that the PNP should be planning for to deliver the vision in meeting the needs of the town.</p> <p>In addition to a flexible approach to future development proposals, to assist Central Bedfordshire Council in the delivery of the District's housing needs we suggest that the site assessment that underpins the allocations in the PNP is revisited, with the potential to accommodate further site allocations a consideration. We suggest there are further sustainable development opportunities adjacent to Potton that could help assist the delivery of housing needs of the town, such as the site we are promoting south of Sandy Road, Potton.</p> <p>The current level of housing to be delivered on the proposed site allocations is not deemed to be sufficient to make a significant contribution in delivering Vision B of the PNP and further development in Potton is required. Further site allocations should be made supported by a flexible approach to further development proposals.</p>	<p>The Policy reference here is incorrect and should be HO-3.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the development sites and types of dwelling which would be supported by the local residents and also those which would not be supported. Of course, normal planning application assessment rules would be applied to any additional proposal put forward</p> <p>Comments noted although Policy HO-4 covers this issue</p> <p>It is not accepted that by supporting those sites shown in the Plan we are taking a restrictive approach. At the time of our Plan development, the call for sites from Central Bedfordshire Council and their assessment had been made. These included some sites already approved for construction and therefore only those sites were included in the overall Plan.</p> <p>The PNP does not set out to restrict housing development in the settlement. We are aware that the Local Plan is still at a stage where final figures for this area are still undecided, but we are not in a position to introduce any new policy to cover changes in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Our activities involving the local residents and the level of their housing needs have been adequately covered in the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan is a living document and once it has been published as part of planning law it can be used to accommodate or otherwise additional suggestions as to how the Town could accept additional housing development or not as the case may be at the time.</p> <p>We are unaware that further development is needed as you have suggested. There are a number of existing developments which could supply the apparent need in Potton and some of which satisfy aspects within our Vision B.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-5 & HO6	<p>Planning Prospects support the intentions and aspirations of these two policies to deliver housing that meets the specific needs however without the additional flexibility and further site allocations it is not sure how these needs can be delivered.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We are pleased that you support these policies notwithstanding the fact that you express that there is a need for more flexibility and further site allocations.</p>
Policy HO-7	<p>In stating that affordable housing provision will be sought in line with the requirements of Central Bedfordshire Council, this policy adds no further local detail to that already contained within the adopted Development Plan nor the emerging Local Plan and we therefore suggest that this policy is unnecessary and therefore deleted</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We consider that this policy is a necessary adjunct to that of Central Bedfordshire Council and emphasises the importance of this issue following our housing needs survey within the Town.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-8	<p>We are concerned that this policy seeks to set a cap on the level of rural exception sites that will be supported. The Framework is supportive of the use of rural exception sites to help meet affordable needs. Seeking to cap delivery of these sites does not accord with the Framework and this policy should be modified to encourage these sites to come forward.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is felt that by capping these exception sites at an acceptable level it will accord with the housing needs survey and will control the spread and number of sites to a sensible level.</p>
Policy EV-1	<p>We are concerned with the weight that this policy seeks to attach to the Potton GI plan. Noting what the GI Plan is seeking to achieve on the site we are promoting for development, the GI plan should be applied flexibly to planning proposals that provide and enhance alternative green</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Plan is the result of the outcomes of two public consultative workshops. The plan embodies the aspirations of the community of Potton with regards to ensuring there is appropriate green infrastructure provision within the town for the future.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy EV-3	<p>Planning Prospects are concerned with some of the proposed Local Green Space designations (LGS) and the evidence that supports these designations. The current evidence base supports the designation of 6 parcels of land as LGS. Planning Prospects consider a number of these settlements to be extensive tracts of land in relation to the settlement of Potton and therefore conflicting with Paragraph 77 of the Framework and the criteria that a proposed LGS needs to meet to be supported.</p> <p>Further, there is no basis for seeking for sites adjacent to proposed LGS to be protected, in effect extending these parcels of LGS. The policy currently does not accord with Paragraph 78 of the Framework and the circumstances upon which development on a LGS designation would be supported. Planning Prospects suggest that the evidence base is revisited with numerous LGS designations being deleted from the PNP.</p>	<p>Comments noted the policy will be reviewed.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Plan is the result of the outcomes of two public consultative workshops. The ranking of aspiration 20 was made by residents attending the Green Infrastructure Plan workshops. The selection and designation of the LGS sites has been undertaken by BRCC in line with guidance.</p>
Policy EV-5	<p>We are concerned that this policy seeks for all proposals to exercise ‘their duty to protect’. There is no duty to protect in the Framework, with the Core planning principles instead seeking for conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.</p> <p>Paragraph 113 of the Framework refers to the need for criteria based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas, and that protection should be commensurate with their status which gives appropriate weight to their importance and contributions to wider networks.</p> <p>Currently the policy fails to make a distinction and recognise that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken for national and local designated sites and their settings. We therefore suggest that the policy is revisited to ensure that it is consistent with the approach set out within the Framework.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Site Assessment Report	<p>We object to how the site has been currently assessed in the Site Assessment Report supporting the Potton Neighbourhood Plan and for the reasons set out below suggest the site should instead be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>We have objected to the inclusion of our site within the proposed Local Plan Countryside Gap, as land to the south of Sandy Road, Potton is well contained and does not contribute towards any intrinsic features of the surrounding countryside. Equally, development of this site would clearly not cause coalescence to any neighbouring settlements. This should therefore not be a reason for the site not to be allocated in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Whilst the site is beyond the settlement envelope the site is contained and is adjacent to a recently granted planning consent and therefore would not be seen as isolated development, as suggested in the report.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the impacts on Potton Cemetery can be mitigated against and the scheme offers significant benefits including extension to the cemetery and the provision of additional parking. These improvements clearly outweigh any perceived effect on the cemetery.</p> <p>Overall, of the comments raised regarding the site we do not believe any of the constraints identified could not be mitigated against and any harm from development of this site is expected to be far outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The site assessment is aligned to that undertaken by Central Bedfordshire Council as part of the proposed local plan and supplemented by local knowledge and the evidence collected from the neighbourhood plan consultation exercises.</p>
180608 Jay Farm NP Reps: Original PDF file received by email on18/06/2018 @ 10:00 and Document divided in to separate comments and put in to table for response:		

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Vision B	<p>Vision B within the Neighbourhood Plan outlines that there will be a controlled, proportionate and uniform growth over the period of the Plan with sustainable developments that meet the needs of the town and its residents. In our view this is inappropriate, as it fails to seek to boost the supply of housing, and should thus be updated accordingly to respond to national policy.</p> <p>In our view, the Neighbourhood Plan as it stands is not ambitious enough, and we would encourage the Plan to go further in terms of its housing objectives. Currently the Plan aims to meet the needs of the town's residents, as set out in Vision B. This clearly fails to fully respond to the wider context of the district. We note that the current Objectively Assessed Need for housing identified for Central Bedfordshire does not appear to fully reflect the housing need, and we would anticipate the housing targets to be appropriately increased to reflect the significant opportunities within the district to meet unmet need in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Potton is described to be centred on a historic market square and has been subject to expansion and consolidation through the development of modern estate-scale development and infill in recent years. The town benefits from a number of busy shops and public amenities which support the needs of the local community. Potton is identified as a minor service centre within the settlement hierarchy, providing a focus for employment, shopping and community facilities for the local community and surrounding rural communities. As such, the site is a sustainable location for future housing growth.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Plan should positively plan for growth with regards to the strategically unique position of the district, which is located at the centre of the Oxford to Cambridge Corridor, which presents opportunities for significant growth over the coming decades. As outlined in National Infrastructure Commission Report (2017) there is major potential for improved connectivity and growth within Central Bedfordshire, providing a once-in-a-generation opportunity to capitalise on the planned infrastructure improvements which have been given significant weight by Central Government in the most recent Autumn Statement (2017).</p> <p>The coordination of major growth at a sub-regional level presents the opportunity to align new jobs, housing and infrastructure to deliver a sustainable form of development, recognising the district's strong links with London, Milton Keynes, Bedford and Luton. Central Bedfordshire is ideally placed within the corridor to take full advantage of the planned infrastructure improvements, unlocking significant levels of growth, given its strategic position within the centre of the Corridor.</p> <p>Potton has the potential to support growth as part of the wider opportunities in the Corridor. This is highlighted in the NIC report (2017), which encourages the delivery of comprehensive economic-led growth across the corridor. We urge the steering group to give greater consideration to the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is not the intention of the Plan in any way to avoid supporting sustainable growth of housing in the Parish. We do not accept that the use of the words 'controlled, proportionate and uniform' when applied to proposed housing building levels is inappropriate, since we have established through surveys with residents that they do not want disproportionately high levels of building to take place during the term of the Plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	<p>growth facilitated by new infrastructure within the preparation of this plan, thereby limiting the need to subsequently amend the plan through an early review.</p>	

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Vision D	<p>Infrastructure Provision: Vision D has identified the need for provision of healthcare, education and physical infrastructure. Any such requirements must be subject to the provisions of paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and viability considerations, as discussed further below in relation to specific policies.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
page 23	<p>Furthermore, it is unclear whether the Green Infrastructure (GI) Plan (Figure 1) shown on page 23 is intended to be an achievable strategy or if this is a general aspiration. There are no details of how the Plan would bring this land forward as GI and how these sites would interrelate as a wider GI network.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Action plans will be drawn up once/if the plan is adopted.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Zone A	<p>Other Comments</p> <p>It is also unclear what specifically the Plan is referring to when it uses the terminology 'significant natural features and attractive views', as no further detail is provided on what views are being discussed with regards to Zone A.</p>	<p>The code for Sustainable Homes can no longer be a requirement of planning conditions and where a local planning authority adopts a policy to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability, they should do so only by reference to Requirement M4(2) and/or M4(3) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations</p>
	<p>Other Comments</p> <p>The references to Lifetime Homes and is outdated with the housing standards having been streamlined in March 2015 by Written Ministerial Statement. We suggest that these references should therefore be removed or replaced to reflect the latest technical approach to housing standards.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Yes, we are supporting commuting.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
CI-1,2 &5-7	<p>We note the importance of ensuring growth is supported and facilitated by appropriate infrastructure provision in order to achieve sustainable development, and indeed development has a key role to play in terms of providing the necessary funding, and supporting the maintenance and enhancement of local services and facilities.</p> <p>We understand that Central Bedfordshire is in the process of preparing its Community Infrastructure Levy for adoption. In advance of this, developer contributions will be sought via S106 agreements where required. Policy HQ2 of the draft Central Bedfordshire Local Plan requires developers to make appropriate contributions to offset the cost of providing new physical, social and environmental infrastructure required as a result of their proposals.</p> <p>In this context, the intention of policies CI-1, CI-2 and CI-5 – CI-7 would appear to be broadly reasonable. However, clearly any such requirements must be subject to the provisions of paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), which states that planning obligations must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) Directly related to the development; and c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <p>Furthermore, paragraph 173 of the NPPF emphasises the need to ensure viability and deliverability, stating that obligations and policy burdens should not be of such a scale that the ability of sites to be developed would be threatened. It goes on to indicate that in order to ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to the development should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.</p> <p>Consequently it is important to emphasise within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan that any such requirements would be subject to the relevant tests regarding necessity and reasonableness, and also subject to viability considerations, thereby ensuring such policies do not place an undue burden on development and potentially limit the delivery of much-needed homes. We are concerned that the policies as currently worded do not include such provisions and thus in our view the Plan does not meet the basic conditions as identified at paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), and that in order to remedy this, the policies should explicitly state, or be preceded by an explanation that, these requirements would be subject to such considerations.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The policies CI-1-C7 have been clarified.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
CI-3	<p>In addition, we consider that the wording of Policy CI-3 is ambiguous, as it is unclear how development proposals would promote the creation of small and medium sized businesses. For example, there is no indication of how a proposal for residential development would achieve this aim, and consequently the policy would not, in our view, be effective. We also note that the supporting text relating to Policy CI-2 appears to have been inadvertently replicated for this policy.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The policies C1-C7 have been clarified.</p>
Policy HO-1	<p>This policy seeks to require development proposals to adhere to the Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide requirements, as set out within Appendices E and F of the Neighbourhood Plan. We broadly support the intention to achieve a high standard of design that reinforces local distinctiveness, however as set out within paragraph 60 of the NPPF, it is important to ensure that this policy does not have the effect of imposing architectural styles or particular tastes.</p> <p>Having regard to the supporting text of the policy, we are concerned that the support for housing growth is caveated with the phrase “provided it is not excessive”. In our view this is an unnecessary and unduly negative reference which suggests a desire to limit the scale of development in the town rather than seeking to positively support and significantly boost the supply of housing as advocated by paragraph 47 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We are pleased that you 'broadly' support our intention to achieve a high level of design. It is not our intention to impose any particular style of architecture or taste. However we do reserve our right to ensure that any proposed development should not affect the existing character of a 'small market town'.</p> <p>As we have already stated, it is not our intention in the Plan to prevent housing development. We have established through consultation with the residents that if we do not incorporate some form of control over the amount, size and quality of house building, we shall end up with far too many units of the wrong size and poor quality. We do not seek to mitigate the needs of the NPPF by imposing unacceptable demands in the Plan.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-2	<p>We strongly object to the suggestion within draft Policy HO-2 that residential development over the plan period should be achieved at an even rate and not exceed the Design Guide build rate per annum. Having reviewed the Design Guide at Appendix E, we are unaware of any specific reference to a build rate per annum within the Guide as implied by the policy. Notwithstanding, in our view the implication that rates of development within Potton would be artificially constrained would fundamentally contradict with the intention of paragraph 47 of the NPPF to significantly boost the supply of housing, with a particular focus on short-term delivery through the identification of a 5 year supply of housing (with an additional 5% or 20% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land).</p> <p>Furthermore, the implied desire to limit the rate at which either planning permission is granted or that permitted sites are built out would fundamentally fail to comply with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at paragraph 14 of the NPPF and at Policy SP2 of the draft Central Bedfordshire Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the supporting text to the policy seeks to justify a restrictive approach to supply in Potton on the basis of supposed infrastructure constraints including parking, traffic and health service provision, the Plan is not supported by any evidence detailing the specific nature and extent of such constraints and the reasons why these would limit growth to a specific (apparently unspecified) level. Consequently any cap on the rate of delivery of new housing would be unjustified. Meanwhile the impact of additional dwellings on local infrastructure could reasonably be mitigated through developer obligations and contributions linked to future planning permissions, whilst the delivery of growth and the additional population associated with this would support the viability and improvements of local services in Potton.</p> <p>As such, we consider that the Plan is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, and is contrary to the requirements of paragraph 184 of the NPPF by seeking to limit development and undermining the Local Plan’s strategic policies (including Policy SP1, which sets out the overarching growth strategy for Central Bedfordshire over the 2015-35 period and the requirement to deliver 39,350 new homes). We therefore consider that it is necessary for this policy to be deleted before the Neighbourhood Plan can be adopted.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We are aware that reference to a build-out rate to be applied to any development has been included and cross-reference made to the Design Guide. The Plan will not be restricting the build rate to certain rate per annum as this will be dependent on the particular planning application and terms therein. However our build rate aspiration is supported by National Planning policy and we believe this is achievable to ensure during the plan duration there is an even and measured expansion expressed as a build rate per annum.</p> <p>We cannot accept the statements made in your response regarding constraints including parking, traffic and health provision. We have established through direct dialogue with residents on a number of occasions that they are extremely concerned about these very issues, and that the influx of new housing will only add to the already weakened infrastructure if no constraints are put into place to ease this very important topic. The growth strategy for Central Bedfordshire has still not been ratified, therefore we cannot understand why you call for our Policy to be deleted at this stage when clearly you have failed to understand why we included it.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-3	<p>Policy HO-3 seeks to limit residential development to those sites which have been identified within the Neighbourhood Plan (as sites A-F and 8 & 13). This requirement would seemingly prevent windfall sites from being permitted, which again would fundamentally contradict the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at 14 of the NPPF and at Policy SP2 of the draft Central Bedfordshire Local Plan, and would thus fail to meet the relevant basic conditions for Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Furthermore, as noted above, we consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should show greater ambition in the context of the significant housing need within Central Bedfordshire, and having regard to Potton’s position within the settlement hierarchy, and Central Bedfordshire’s position within the Oxford-Cambridge Growth Arc and the associated significant infrastructure upgrades to unlock growth.</p> <p>The number of sites identified within the Neighbourhood Plan is very limited, and it is unclear whether this will enable Potton to make a sufficient contribution towards the overall level of growth required across Central Bedfordshire as set out within draft Local Plan Policy SP1. This Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity to positively embrace the significant social and economic benefits of growth to ensure a sustainable long term future for the town. Consequently we consider that the Plan should identify additional locations for growth, and consider the potential to allocate additional sites for residential development.</p> <p>In this regard, the land at Jay Farm provides a significant opportunity to help meet local housing need and deliver significant benefits to the local community, as discussed in further detail at Section 4. This site was assessed (under reference Site 17) within Annex A (Site Assessments) as being unsuitable due to its location outside the existing settlement its potential impact on local views and relative distance from the town centre. However, as discussed in Section 4, we consider that this site would comprise a logical and sustainable extension to the town and is only a short walk from the town centre and its various services and facilities. It is unclear on what basis the assessment has concluded that development of this site would “dominate the vista of Potton”, given the lack of further details or evidence, whilst clearly the suggested impact on views from existing dwellings near the site would not be a material planning consideration. Meanwhile no evidence or further explanation has been provided as to why development of this site would be detrimental to the aspiration to create a publicly accessible nature reserve to the north of the site. Consequently the basis on which the site has been dismissed is in our view inadequate.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the development sites and type of dwelling which would be supported by the local residents and also those which would not be supported. Of course, normal planning application assessment rules would be applied to any additional proposal put forward.</p> <p>We do not accept your statement that this policy seeks to limit residential development to those sites identified within the Neighbourhood Plan. We have specifically referred to 'windfall' category housing in Annex A - Site Assessment and would draw your attention to this Annex.</p> <p>We take exception to your continuous assumption that we deliberately try and play down the need to accept the premise of housing shortage. We understand that there is a housing shortfall, but as it has been pointed out to us on numerous occasions by residents, the wrong houses are being developed and those people waiting for small 1 or 2-bedroom houses feel that their needs are not being met. As for planning to be in the vanguard of the Oxford to Cambridge Link and become a recipient of 'significant infrastructure upgrades', we feel that we need a lot more confidence in Central Government's commitments before we can plan for that future.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-4	<p>Policy HO-4 seeks to require all (presumably residential) development proposals to include “a proportion” of 1 or 2 bedroom properties “designed to be appropriate for occupation by first time buyers or those on a lower income”. However, there is no associated evidence provided regarding the level of need for 1 or 2 bedroom properties, and thus it is unclear whether this policy requirement is justified. Meanwhile the policy is not specific regarding the proportion that will be required. We note that on certain sites it may be unsuitable to include an element of 1 or 2 bedroom properties, particularly if the prevailing character is one of larger, detached dwellings. Furthermore, the policy does not explain what would make a property suitable for first time buyers or those on a lower income. It is unclear whether this would introduce an additional requirement to the affordable housing policy set out in Policy H4 of the draft Central Bedfordshire Local Plan, and if so, whether this has been subject to viability assessment to consider the extent to which it would be viable to deliver this additional requirement as part of a development proposal.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We cannot be so proscriptive as to demand that a certain proposal shall be identified as having to provide suitable housing for first time buyers or those on low incomes unless the proposal has ignored the parameters of the current SHMA. We shall of course comply with these policies set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan consultation exercise highlighted the need/requirement for smaller properties thus this is reflected within the plan.</p>
Policy HO-6	<p>We note that Lifetime Homes standards have been replaced by national technical housing standards and building regulations, and as such, the reference to Lifetime Homes within the policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>Already noted and responded to above.</p> <p>We understand that we cannot insist on 'Lifetime Homes' being used as a design standard for these types of homes. However, we have been advised that the code for Sustainable Homes can no longer be a requirement of planning conditions and where a local planning authority adopts a policy to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability, they should do so only by reference to Requirement M4(2) and / or M4(3) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations.</p>

Section Page	Public Comment	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy HO-9	<p>The wording of Policy HO-9 is far from clear, and we are concerned that it could be interpreted as indicating that Permitted Development rights as set out within the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 are removed from properties within the settlement. Having regard to the supporting text to the policy, it would appear that the intention is actually to prevent the loss of accommodation built to meet specific needs. The policy wording is however far from clear on this point, and there is also a question as to whether this requirement would be enforceable should applications come forward for internal works or changes to existing properties within a C3 use class.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We understand your concern about the implications contained in this policy. What we are trying to prevent here is the indiscriminate alteration of properties which have been built to satisfy a certain need and hence any alterations or changes to that property in such a way that it can no longer be used for the original need, thereby reducing that type of available property from the property bank. For instance, perhaps adding another storey to a bungalow-this would fall into that category of unpermitted development. Accordingly, such a change would not be supported, but a Central Bedfordshire Council planning decision would clearly take precedence.</p>