

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

Response Reference NoA1:	Are you broadly happy with the content of the Neighbourhood Plan?	Page Number	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Topic	Comment	Proposed Response or Action	Action	Organisation
1	Yes	11		2.13		Where are the reserved sites detailed and where can we find details of CS16 Part D.	Add hyperlink to the Stratford District Council website -Site Allocation.	Amend document.	Resident
1		11		2.18		What is the scope of a HRS, as triggered by significant environmental impacts.	Refer to SDC - No change to plan.	Noted.	Resident
1		14		3.18		Obviously latest plan submitted is for 100 mixed use houses.	NDP will be updated to reflect the latest planning applications.	Amend document.	Resident
1		16		4.3		Please can more emphasis be made that this is a rural community.	0	Noted.	Resident
1		17		4.5	Footpaths & Lanes	More protection for the historic footpaths and lanes.	Discuss.	Footpaths are already protected and lanes are under the jurisdiction of the Highways, text will be amplified in NDP.	Resident
1		17		4.6	Hedgerows	Important to retain hedgerows.	No change to plan.	Noted.	Resident
1		17		4.8	Views	Importance of view over AC Lloyd site.	Discuss.	13 views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident
1		17		4.11	Factual correction	3 storey houses also on Vicarage Rd.	Update plan.	Update.	Resident
1		18		4.16	Village maintenance	Viewing point improvements/repair.	Beyond the scope of the NDP - referred to the Parish Council / Community Aspirations Section.	Refer to NPC.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

1		19		4.18	Traffic management	Concerns regarding the increased traffic coming from Brickyard development.	No change to NDP - matter specific to this planning application.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
1		19		4.19	Parking	There are concerns with parking and increased traffic from Arc School if it expands.	No change to NDP - not aware of any plans to expand.	Noted.	Resident
1		19		4.2	Footpaths & Lanes	Supports retention of green links especially Fells Lane.	Review as part of character assessment.	The importance of green lanes and tracks has been reflected in the character assessment.	Resident
1		20		4.22		If we continue to infill there will be no natural features to help mask other infills.	Assume this refers to the need to retain some open spaces within the more developed areas of the village.	Proposed local green spaces have been identified some of which are in the village centre.	Resident
1		23		4.32	Verges	Protection of highway verges.	No change to NDP - beyond the scope of NDP.	Noted.	Resident
1		25		4.39	Village maintenance	Could a policy help to protect our roads from damage caused by developments?	Discuss with group.	Maintenance of roads is a highways issue and therefore outside the scope of the Plan. However traffic management is one of the key topics in the Community Aspirations section. The Parish Council will be able to use this to start a debate on this topic.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

1		26		4.43	Footpaths & Lanes	There is a footpath from Butt Hill to Kings Head but not from Hillside unless you use the path on opposite side.	Update wording in plan.	Update.	Resident
1		28		5.14	Brickyard development	Work/ live units on Brickyard.	Planning application has expired - No change to NDP.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
1		31		5.29	Traffic management	Potential increase from any new developments.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
1		32		5.3	Public transport	Services are reducing.	No change to NDP - beyond the scope of NDP.	Amend NDP.	Resident
1		32		5.31	Factual correction	Bus stop also on Vicarage Rd and Butt Hill.	Update the plan.	Amend NDP.	Resident
1		34		5.43	Footpaths & Lanes	Improvements needed in some areas.	No change to NDP - beyond the scope of NDP - refer to PC.	Noted.	Resident
1		38	v	7.7	Open spaces	Add protection for historic fields. Provide opportunities for young people e.g. youth club.	Covered by policies 10 and policy 12.	Noted.	Resident
1		45		8.27	Open spaces	Importance of field above AC Lloyd site.	Discuss with the group.	The field above Quincy Meadow (previously the AC Lloyd site) has been proposed as a Local green Space.	Resident
1		49		8.44	Self build plots	Query raised re serviced plots.	District Council function.	Noted.	Resident
1		53		8.61	Brickyard development	How can "brickyard" site be integrated without footpath and cycle lane.	Noted. Will be addressed as part of planning application.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

1		76		8.111	Green spaces	Include verges within paragraph.	Amend to "significant trees, hedgerows and verges".	Amend NDP.	Resident
1		77		8.114	Factual correction	Remove garage from description of village shop. Add garage as separate facility of village.	Remove garage from description of village shop. Add garage as separate facility of village.	Amend NDP.	Resident
1		79		9.5	Traffic management	Raises issue of traffic management reference to speeding and restrictions to heavier vehicles.	No change to NDP - beyor	Noted.	Resident
2	Yes	61	8			I am concerned that there is no specific mention of the allotments in the protected green spaces. Is this an omission or are they protected in another way?	Discuss with group	The land on which the allotments sit is owned by the Parish Council. This affords a degree of protection. It was not felt that the space warranted the status as a Local Green Space.	Resident
3	Yes	17		5		I agree with chapter 4 and the descriptions of Napton village - excellent summary of the character of Napton.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
3		37		7.30		I agree with the vision for Napton and the objectives.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
3		37		7.40		I agree with the vision for Napton and the objectives.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
3		44		8.26		I would particularly like to see the green spaces within the village protected in order to preserve the rural character of the village.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
3		45		0.00		I would particularly like to see the northern half of the field above the present Godson's Lane development as a protected green space.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
3		45		8.28		Agree.	Noted.	No change to plan needed.	Resident
3		53		8.61		Agree.	Noted.	No change to plan needed.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

4	Yes	50		8.58		Old Brick works of A425. The authors of the plan have acknowledged the 'anti-social activities' which take place on the site. To be specific, this is motor cross/off road motorbikes which use the land illegally. Being a close neighbour of the site, I can vouch that EVERY weekend last year between May and October, we had to endure the noise created by the revving of motorbikes. With a new planning application of this land by the owners (St Phillips) only recently being submitted, it is unlikely this issue will be resolved in the near future due to the time constraints with the planning/consultation process. The owners of the land should ensure that the site is fenced appropriately to prevent these illegal activities taking place and the police and Stratford District Council should enforce it.	Outside of scope.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
5	No	2				The makeup of the steering group does not represent the whole community, indeed the indigenous population seem ignored.	Steering group volunteer role was widely advertised.	Noted.	Resident
5		4		1.70		Parish councils were encouraged to produce Development plans prior to SDC producing the draft Core Strategy 6-8 years ago.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
5		12		3.40		Alsop family were involved in the enclosures and still hold a handwritten copy of the land distribution.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
5		12		3.70	Factual correction	There are 4 War memorials in Napton. The history of the main one is told on it. It is a public memorial. Another is the obelisk in the cemetery.	Review and amend.	Document updated.	Resident
5		13		3.17		Redundant/small industrial site with planning permission for residential housing.	Cabtech? Review and amend.	Update.	Resident
5		16		4.20	Factual correction	The view is not from New St- that ends by Howcombe Lane.	Check and amend. Where does New St finish and Thornton's Lane start?	No change required. According to Google maps it is New Street.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

5		17		4.80		Not always known as the Sledging Field. (There were many.) (Best removed) in my opinion.	Remove reference to sledging field . Add phrase "adjacent to the Granary.	Document updated.	Resident
5		19		4.18		Footpath to V.Hall recently added and road widened (10-15 years ago).	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
5		26		4.42		Any proof of the road going up Hillside? I think not? Hillside and Chapel Green were separate settlements adjoining Napton.	Review and amend.	Historical context only. This does not have a bearing on today's plan.	Resident
5		26		4.42		The photo is I believe on Southam Rd? Main Rd was a toll road.	True. Amend.	Document updated.	Resident
5		33		5.33		Add Grantown Playing Field?	Covered under 5.38 no action.	Noted.	Resident
5		33		5.38		Name 'Grantown Playing Field' to maintain the name. Named after Grandborough and Napton, the two favourite villages of the lady who originally donated the land.	Add name into para 5.38.	Plan amended accordingly.	Resident
5		40		8.7 Table 8		Misleading as many applications were granted prior to a built up boundary - so were not outside it?!	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
5		40		8.7 Table 8		Also is Cab Tech residential taken into account?	JV to Check existence.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
5		45		8.28 and 8.29		Is some of the land now being developed? And footpath blocked?	Noted.	No action.	Resident
5		60		8.85		Substantial 'Sports Field' not playing field.	Amend text to reflect.	Plan amended to reflect correct terminology.	Resident
5		60		8.88		The PC maintained greens prior to registration- used to have a funfair there twice a year.	Amend text - remove words "since registration".	Document updated.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

5		60		8.89 and 8.90		Concern that friction with landowners will be caused. Good planning officers could deal with this. Avoids community infighting.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
5		62				Land by church is agricultural and abused by trespassing dog walkers. Can Steering Group stop that? Not encourage it.	Noted, plan has been amended to reflect this.	Document updated.	Resident
5		74				Have to object to new elected officers being involved in affecting landowners' rights. Never needed before except on planning applications case by case.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
5		77		8.115 item 1		Please:(l). Grantown Playing Fields;(k) Skate Park.	Amend.	Document updated.	Resident
5		72	13			There was never an observatory. There were never gunners to my knowledge - what would they shoot at? Mr Crick of Co-op fame led the Royal Observer Corp members and/or volunteers (of whom my father was one). From the top(roof) of the observer post, aircraft were spotted and reported to base. There is a back-filled nuclear bunker nearby. The land belongs to Shuckburgh estate, maintained by Bob and Pat Crick and Tony Gilbert and War Memorial Working Party.	Amend. See also Malcolm Thomas's letter. Remove reference to gunners.	Document updated.	Resident
5		73	13			Observatory Mill Rudd. Must try harder!	Correct typo - Rudd to Road.	Document updated.	Resident
5		46	1	8.23		The built-up area boundary has all the faults of the previous one in that it is so tight that the only hope of development (if needed) is to add to the density of present development which dilutes the feel of space within the village. In addition, if Chapel Green is seen as part of Napton then the line should include it. In the past councillors have visited SDC and had amendments made as necessary.	Discuss.	Not structurally part of a service village, as per SDC policy. (Core strategy).	Resident
5		65	8	8.93		Have landowners been consulted prior to designating their land 'local green spaces'? It would be rather rude not to.	Check.	Yes letters were sent to all the individuals involved.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

5		32		5.34		There is a mention of two Churches, not correct of course, and later the Christadelphian Chapel. On the building it is called the Christadelphian Meeting Room. It is known throughout the world for documents produced there.	check and amend.	Document updated.	Resident
5		16				There is a quote that some roof pitches are 70 degrees, that is similar to a church steeple. Roof angle is taken from the horizontal so suspect 35 degrees is meant.	Check and amend.	Document updated.	Resident
6	no response	19				Napton has over the last 20 years become more developed in the heart of the village, starting to lose its rural character. Every large garden has been used for infill but the road structure is struggling to cope. At your meetings that map of Napton did not show the A.C.Lloyd development which will make the village even more congested. When you look at the village from a distance, it is becoming more urban in appearance. Future development needs to spread out away from the centre of the village. The 'development line' around the village is drawn far too tightly. I would like to see future development more ribbon style on the outskirts of the village, i.e. land to the west of Howcombe Lane, land from New Street down to Thorntons Lane and towards Chapel Green, land off Dog Lane between the village and the Sports Field. The heavy concentration of housing in the centre of the village has contributed to the traffic flow and parking problems we currently experience.	Noted. Discuss BUAB.	The Plan works on the draft BUAB supplied by SDC. The planning policies within the plan set out where development could be considered in the future.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

6		62			Land adjoining St Lawrence Church.	Land adjoining St Lawrence Church. I have already spoken about this land and the description of its use. It is tenanted farmland; its use by villagers to walk their dogs etc is illegal, they are trespassing. So you cannot include it in the plan under its present description.	Amend final sentence.	Document updated.	
6		79			Traffic management	Very little input in this plan concerning traffic and parking issues in the village, which have increased considerably over the last 20 years. As farmers, we find it impossible at times to get through the village with tractors and equipment. Work sometimes has to be planned to avoid weekends when the village is full of parked details. In the plan there are many references to providing off road parking necessary to obtain planning permission, but this off road parking is never legally enforced, hence garage gets used for storage or later date conversion, and vehicles finish up parked on the road or on part path/part road parking causing problems. It would be nice to see some positive ideas to address this problem.	Noted. Outside scope of NVDP? Aspirations?	Noted.	
7	yes	65			Views	Would it be possible to add the extended view from the road above and behind Baynton's Farm to the church? In the recent past, there has been an application to build stables, under agricultural need which have been declared 'redundant' and a barn conversion dwelling appears. Such applications are beginning to encroach on the beautiful views of villagers and walkers along this rural road, both from the road looking south and from Shuckburgh/Potash looking back to the church hilltop.	covered by greenspace B; beyond scope of NVDP.	13 views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	
7		65			Signage	where possible and appropriate, highway signage to be 'painted' on roads to avoid cluttering the street scenes and views.	Noted. Beyond scope of NVDP.	No further action.	

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

8	yes	65,66,59,72		8.95, 8.96, 8.99	view 7 and view 13	A view which I feel should be included is the view on the little Church Lane past Baynton's over the open fields towards Priors Marston - walkers often stop there and tourist, particularly from abroad, have frequently remarked that it shows 'a typical English village' 'unspoilt'. I realise you have a similar vista = at a lower elevation= but I would like to see this protected as that area around the church with those views are absolutely unique and iconic. The soul of Napton.	discuss.	13off views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident
8		56, 57		8.72		so pleased Napton to support community low carbon energy initiatives - could aim to become an eco village? Perhaps a Parish Council steering group?	Noted. For PC.		Resident
8		74,75		8.106		It seems to me a pity that we spray and mow so much in Napton, giving an attractive but suburban aspect to the village. It would be both attractive and environmentally desirable to turn some of those mowed spaces into wild flower meadows= particularly steep banks. On flatter surfaces, you could have a mown green path. It would add to the pleasure of walking to see the return of wild flowers and for children growing up in the country village a chance to recognise and enjoy the wild flowers I knew when I was a child.	Discuss.	This is not a matter for planning policy however it would be part of projects which may flow from the plan in the future. The Community Aspirations section of the plan makes reference to footpaths and rights of way. This topic could be discussed alongside these issues.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

8		19, 20		4.21, 4.22		While there is no standard building type in Napton - so that it is difficult to define a 'vernacular' style - there are many attractive buildings. It does seem a pity that many of the newer buildings and indeed some of the older could have been built anywhere in the country. They are such standard builder's design of any particular decade. It would be good if designs appropriate to a village and perhaps containing a nod to local ironstone and bricks could be put forward. Several new estates in Oxfordshire seem to do this - as well as placing houses at angles rather than back to back rows - much more attractive. Jackson's Close does have some charm (and some ironstone!) despite being a relatively new build. So it can be done!	Discuss; more specific requirements need adding to the NDP.	Planning Policy 1.E within the draft plan states that development must have regard to the Character Assessment. The Parish Council may consider further work to produce a design guide at some point.	Resident
8					Canal path	Is there a possibility of making a safe cycle route to Southam? Good for pollution, senior school pupils and everyone!	Noted; beyond scope of NVDP.	Noted.	Resident
9	yes	18		4.16		Should there be a semi colon after 'Howcombe Lane'?	No.	Noted.	Resident
9		44		8.26	Typos	Should there be a semi colon after 'Howcombe Lane'?	No.	Noted.	Resident
9		66		8.99		Can the Charity Field, to the NE of Godson's Lane, be protected from housing development?	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
9		71,74		8.106		It is in many of the protected views e.g. pictures 10&11 on p71, surrounded by trees and hedges ref 8.106 and valued green space in the village.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

10	no response	72	13			The War memorial Working Party (WMWP) have some minor comments. The plan describes the site on Mill Road as the 'Observatory Memorial'. This is not quite correct, it should be described as the 'Observer Post Memorial'. Also , it is maintained by the War memorial Working Party, not by the War Memorial Committee. The WMWP is not a committee. The WMWP were very interested to learn from the Draft Plan that gunners were posted on site. The source of this information would be useful for our records.	Check and amend.	Document amended.	Resident
11	yes	46	1			Defining the BUAB is in itself an important step. It appears to be sensible and a good baseline.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
11		48	2			provided modest in scale and in step with the Housing Needs Survey. I support as an exception to the BUAB.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
11		55	4			More local employment opportunities is good for the 'bigger' picture - i.e. reducing commutes - but impact on local infrastructure is critical; for example, increased traffic on Brickyard Road. Should modest expansion of the Folly Rd industrial estate be considered?	Discuss.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
11		59	7			Good to see the importance of the surrounding services recognised. What a pity Napton Bridge PH has been lost.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
11		65	8			Totally agree.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
11		73	9			Totally agree.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
12	Yes			8.8	Affordable homes	More affordable homes needed.	Covered in policy 1.	No change needed.	Resident
12		53		8.5	Brickyard	Brickworks development should be agreed ASAP.	Covered in policy 4 and in NPCs response to the SAP.	No change needed.	Resident
12				8.63	Local businesses	Many local businesses are sole traders working from home. Hard to support these.	Noted but policy on technologies and digital infrastructure would be relevant .	No change needed.	Resident
12				8.69	Objectives 4,5 and 6	All important and could be grouped into one section.	Noted.	No change needed.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

12				8.112	Services and facilities	Local transport and other services are vital.	Noted. Many services are the responsibility of the County Council but NPC is working to influence and ensure on going provision.	No change needed.	Resident
12	yes				Community Aspirations	Traffic management should be a key topic going forward.	Noted, plan already reflects this.	No change needed.	Resident
13				5.3	Public transport	Information on the number of buses is incorrect.	Hyperlinks to up to date timetables will be added into the plan.	Plan amended accordingly.	Resident
13				5.38	Sports activities at NVH	No mention of activities which take place at NVH.	Update plan to include these.	Plan amended accordingly.	Resident
14	yes	78		8.117	Digital infrastructure	Vital that superfast broad band and good mobile signal is available to all.	Included within policy 13.	Noted no change needed.	Resident
14				8.61	Brickyard	Supports development of approx. 80 dwellings.	Parish Council's response to the SAP reflects this.	Already reflected in the plan.	Resident
15	Yes	46	Policy 1	-	Housing policies	Both policies (1&2) should concentrate on the need for affordable starter homes and bungalows. The bungalows should include high quality properties so that people downsizing feel they are purchasing something of value and a space to enjoy.	Affordable housing both referenced and covered in Policies 1 & 2 - No change proposed to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
15		50	Policy 3		Energy standards for new builds	All new builds should have energy saving measures e.g. solar, thermal.	Connection to Policy 3 unclear - all new housing has to comply with energy saving regulations. No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
15		56 & 81	5 & Aspirations			Cycle link between Southam and Napton.	Propose adding to Community Aspirations P81, sub paragraph c?	Whilst outside of the scope of the planning policies the topic is covered in Community Aspirations section of the plan.	Resident
15						Traffic management. Improved visibility at crossroads is vital, parking at The Kings Head inhibits safe outlook.	Beyond the scope of the NDP - Refer to Parish Council for specific action with the management of the pub.	No change to NDP.	Resident
16	Yes	12		3.9		Site of old spring in Chapel Green. (If this is to be included, as is within the neighbourhood area).	Add details of the spring into paragraph.	Update the plan.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

16		17		4.8		Recognise that Chapel Green only mentioned as neighbouring hamlet but if building likely, helpful to include view towards Oxford Canal, to include site of Old Chapel & ridge & furrow field.	Suggestion to add another view across the Oxford Canal. Chapel Green not part of local service village therefore building opportunity servily restricted by core strategy.	Document updated with reference to Chapel green.	Resident
16				4.10		Farmers cottages, some with remaining layout e.g. Outside toilet, wood store, veg gardens.	Suggests a unique of character assessment at Chapel Green??	Discuss.	Resident
16		23				West - no reference of hamlet to Chapel Green.	As above.	Document updated with reference to Chapel green.	Resident
16		33		5.36		Correct title for the Arc School is independent specialist day school for pupils experiencing a range of social, emotional and mental health needs.	No change to NDP.	Noted.	Resident
16		35				Environmental issues.	Beyond the scope of the NDP.	Noted.	Resident
16		36/7				Add the word wellbeing into 7.4 (7) 7.7 translate to Table 7.	Update the plan Comment unclear.	Discuss.	Resident
16		61			Table 9	Local Green Spaces. A - Napton Sports Club.	Statement of fact - no further action.	No further action.	Resident
16		66		8.99		Views proposal Map 3 "Vista is towards Oxford Canal from gateway on chapel green..."	View <u>is</u> from The Blue House on the main road, not from Chapel Green.	13off views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident
16		76		8.112 (b)		You may wish to add mental health to health and mental health as this is becoming a social issue.	Possible wording change.	Where appropriate amend in next phase of consultation.	Resident
16		79		9.8		Traffic management. Speeding of farm machinery - I have witnessed 2 near fatal accidents this year.	Refer to Parish Council.	Not in the scope of this document.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

17	Yes	41		8.9 & 8.10		We believe that development should be to the west of the village because lots has been to the east and brickyard is an ideal site and in need of development. Should be included in the core boundary area. Brickyard is clearly in Napton and people would use Napton facilities.	Paragraph 8.10 & table needs to be updated to reflect the latest planning permission. Discuss whether we propose a change to the BUAB (Link to line 54).	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	
17		44		8.26		We strongly support important that the important open spaces should be protected and valued.	Noted.	Noted.	
17		45		8.27 & 8.29		The views of the planning inspector should be respected and the rest of the field should remain agricultural.	Noted.	Noted.	
17		49		8.42 & 8.47		Self Build is great but should not be used as a way of circumventing the plan, policies and boundaries.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
17		50		8.50 & 8.62		We agree with the development of the Brickyard because it is a mess and a brownfield site. It should be included in the Napton BUAB see points 8.9/9.10.	Paragraph 8.10 & table needs to be updated to reflect the latest planning permission. Discuss whether we propose a change to the BUAB (link to line 50).	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
17		61/63		8.92		We agree with protection of local green spaces, policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
17		65/69		8.99		We agree with protection of important views, they are the defining feature of Napton on the Hill and contribute to the well being of the local population and visitors.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
18	Yes	33		5.38		Lack of mention of other activities in the village hall such Badminton and Indoor Bowls.	Include section on Village Activities. Resequencing numbers 5.38 x 2.	Update plan.	Resident
18		34		extra section		Proposed extra section - Green Lanes like Fells Lane to be protected.	Agree with proposal - update plan.	Update plan.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

18		51		8.5	Proposed Brickworks development	Generally supportive of building on the brickyard site providing numbers count towards the local service village 2.		Noted. No action required.	Resident
18						General comment on lack of guidance on suitable housing styles.	Character Assessment provides context for housing styles.	No changes needed to plan but highlight issues to Parish Council for further consideration.	Resident
19	Yes	20		4.23		Characteristics of individual areas focus on 6 sub areas in Napton but do not include Chapel Green. Would be good to see it included and highlight within the Napton NDP document the importance of maintaining chapel green as a separate community to help protect against the future threat of merging into the main village.	Discuss with group.	Section on Chapel Green has been included in Character Assessment.	Resident
19		45		8.27	Important view 3	Strongly agree with points regarding land above AC Lloyd development.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
19		70			View 9	Important view 9. The aspect which is identified in view 9 is visible at any time of year from several places along the southern entrance to the village e.g. along Holt road, by the canal, along Marston doles road, as such we question whether one specific location can be pulled out as "important" over these other views. comments surround the visual representation of the view is misleading due to the nature of hedge growth through the year and the obligation of the landowner to trim only every two years to comply with stewardship. The view is only partly visible in the winter months. The image was also taken by being close to hedge - "does not reflect how the area is accessed". Summary of respondent is they have never seen anyone looking over the hedge to see view 9 as depicted in image 9.	Discuss with group. Review imagery.	13off views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

19		65			Views	Additional important view proposed "from field next to the weir" looking south - visible by those walking to the folly or into the village and forms visual connection with chapel green.	Review with group.	13off views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident
19		77		8.115		Questions if policy will realistically protect the listed business.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
20	Yes	55		8.66		Tourism business, does not mention self catering holiday properties - Kock Cottage, Folly Flats.	Add in Holiday Lets into section 8.66.	Update plan.	Resident
20		59		8.82		Same comment as above - Canal Shop is closed.	Update the plan.	Update plan.	Resident
20		68				Cover picture of National Geographic - Unchanged since 1974.	Acknowledged - No change to plan.	Noted.	Resident
20		77		8.114		Village Store does not include a garage.	Update wording in the plan.	Update plan.	Resident
21	Yes	21				I am happy for "The Wilderness" to be included within the village boundary.	Comment noted.	No action.	Resident
22		45		8.27		Summarised as: Preserve the open space above AC Lloyd site.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
22		19		4.20		Importance of trees and hedgerows. More trees to be planted in the new build area to improve appearance and benefit remaining wildlife.	Beyond the scope of the plan.	Noted.	Resident
22		50		8.50		I fail to understand why the plans for Napton Brickyard & its c.80 houses do not count in the Napton Core strategy. Afterall half Napton is on the North side of the main road. Also Brickyard should include services for boaters which are sadly lacking on the canal side in Napton.	Link to line 50 - BUAB discussion & Numbers for LSV2 Noted.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
22		56				Summarised as: Light pollution a concern at Godsons Lane Development.	Beyond the scope of NDP.	Noted.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

22		62				The open land green verges on the top of the hill are precious and everything possible should be done to preserve the rural and peaceful atmosphere here.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
23	Yes					Does the NDP cover all important issues facing the village - Employment, Infrastructure, Leisure and well being.	Noted - out of scope of the NDP.	Noted.	Resident
23						Growth / Aspirations - only possible if the essential supporting services are improved including, healthcare facilities, traffic management, roads, footways and parking, community transport, village drainage and local services.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
23	Yes	13		3.10		Description of right of way opposite Granary stating it's a bridle path not footpath. Only footpath in southerly direction.	Change wording from footpath to bridleway.	Update plan.	Resident
24		13		3.11		Delete "around the Hill" from end of paragraph.	Delete "around the Hill" from end of paragraph.	Update plan.	Resident
24				3.12		Amend description of "Warwick and Napton Canal" to "Warwick and Napton Navigation Canal".	Amend description of "Warwick and Napton Canal" to "Warwick and Napton Navigation Canal".	Validate and update plan.	Resident
24				3.14			Amend paragraph to remove " as the cutting where it was located has been filled in."	Update plan.	Resident
24		18		4.15			Amend the Plough to read "Plough and Harrow"	Update plan.	Resident
24		72		13		Amendment to description of observation post.	Remove Gunners from description.	Validate and update plan.	Resident
24		74		8.06		No mention of TPO.	No response needed as TPO in place.	No action.	Resident
24		75		8.11		No mention of TPO.	No response needed as TPO in place.	No action.	Resident
24						Ridge and furrow form many views to and from the village.		Noted.	Resident
25	Yes	10		2.10		I note the number of category 2 dwellings is clarified as 700 across the district not the village for the period of the plan.	Noted	No change.	Resident
25		35		6.1	General	In environmental issue suggesting to be more specific about impact of recent development on open space and character of village.	Amend Negative impact column to read "Concern about the level of house building in the past years and the reduction of open spaces".	Update plan.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

25		43 & 46	1			There is a conflict between BUAB development area and comments about the need to protect the open spaces and important views around the village. This particularly applies to the view from vicarage road towards Shuckburgh (the sledging field as was). Therefore should be pressure to amend the BUAB Agrees with policy one.	BUAB still in draft form and subject to change. Noted.	No action.	Resident
25		48	2			I understand the market need when building affordable homes but I am concerned by the acceptance of "associated market housing" in rural exception areas. This would seem to be backdoor development beyond what's needed.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
25		53		8.62		Agrees with proposals in this paragraph.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
25		56	5		Street Lighting	Concerned by increasing levels of light pollution.	Policy 5 states light pollution for new build should be minimised.	Existing levels of street lighting fall outside the scope of the plan so no change is required but the Parish Council are reviewing provision across the board for environmental and costs reasons.	Resident
25		73	9		Important view and lanes	Suggestion of additional protected view looking south from church road towards Shuckburgh. Fells lane I mentioned as a "green link" within section four but this should be given more emphasis, not necessarily as an important view, but the need to protect it as part of the rural character of the village.	Discuss with group.	13 views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as the inspector is unlikely to accept more than 6 views.	Resident
25		78	13			Policy to include green cabinets.	Noted. Covered in policy wording.	No action.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

26	No	16			Character Assessment	The section numbers differ from the separate character assessment on web site which is very confusing.	Do not understand where the difference exist, having checked the plan we cannot see the differences.	No action.	Resident
26		16			Character Assessment	Assessment is incorrect in places very muddled and not clear.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
26		61			Green Spaces	Napton has many green spaces within the village and does not need anymore.	Noted (opinion).	No action.	Resident
26		61			Green Spaces	Private land should be clearly identified in the plan. Some listed imply they are for community use.	Page 61 para 8.91 makes clear that public access is not a pre-requisite .	No action except 'D' add no right of public access.	Resident
26		61			Green Spaces	By listing Green spaces the plan should not seek to restrict the use of the land by the owners i.e. farmers.	Noted (opinion).	No action.	Resident
26		61			Green Spaces	By Restricting the use of the land it may subsequently have a negative impact on the area i.e. farmers being unable to fence land or neighbours complaining about livestock.	Noted (opinion).	No action.	Resident
26		73	9			Too many views listed, lots of the listed views are the same views, existing benches at view points are enough. Safety/risk assessment should be considered when allocating view points. The view from the bench in the sports field is far reaching and safer than many listed.	Noted (opinion).	13off views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident
26		4/5			Initial Consultation Activities	I question if this plan is necessary and representative of the villagers or just a few indivial. The maximum attendance for a meeting was 55 which is less than 5% of the village population. This was made up of people for and against the plan. For something that is going to affect so many people especially the land owners I feel there should be a greater expressed need for it.	Noted (opinion).	No Action - Consultation process complied with.	Resident
27	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	General	Does not agree with the process of the NDP or the need for a plan as believes that no further building should be done.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

27		N/A	N/A	N/A	General	Believes that nobody has a right to a view and any 'open views' should not be over agricultural land.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
27		N/A	N/A	N/A	General	General autobiography of life in Napton.	Out of Scope.	No further action.	Resident
28	Yes	45		8.3		Good to keep development constrained in Built up area.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
28		50		8.52		It would be good to see better usage of the old brickworks site.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
29	No				Consultation	Disagrees with process carried out and would have preferred NDP group to be less prescriptive. Questionnaires could have been delivered to each household.		Noted .	Resident
29					Consultation	Comparisons of process between NDP & Parish plan (2007) .	Noted.	No Action.	Resident
29		4		1.6	School	Not provided by WCC it is a Coffee, voluntary aided school, provided by the diocese of Coventry.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
29		4		1.7	Background to NDP	Community Consultation Activities' is slightly misleading as this only refers to the formation of the NDP group.	Noted (opinion).	No Action Needed.	Resident
29		5& 6		1.1	Boundary	Neighbourhood Area should actually read Neighbourhood development plan area.	Change wording Neighbourhood area to NDP Area.	Change.	Resident
29		7&8		1.3,1.4	Consultation	Disagrees with process carried out and would have preferred NDP group to be less prescriptive.	Consultation carried out as prescribed by NDP Guidelines.	No Action .	Resident
29		27		5.1	Population	Census 2011 is now out of date. A questionnaire to each household would have remedied this.	Consultation carried out as prescribed by NDP Guidelines.	No Action.	Resident
29		28/29		5.7/5.8	Process	Duplicated observations on consultation process suggestion that the requirement for bungalows as per housing need survey might warrant the allocation of potential land for local market and housing association homes.	The Parish Council has decided not to allocate sites to meet this demand, and has opted instead to have a criteria based approach to any proposals coming forward as set out in Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the submitted plan.	No change required.	Resident
29		29		5.19	Process	Suggestion to expand miscellaneous comments submitted by public in HNS with view to additional representation in plan.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

29		30/31		5.22/5.29	Process	Suggests that 2011 census is significantly out of date and real time information gathering by household survey could have improved on this.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		32		5.3	Bus Service	Question are bus timetables out of date.	Check & Update add hyperlink.		Resident
29		33		5.38	Sporting Facilities	Suggests that additional sporting facilities exist beyond NSA and need adding.	Noted amend.	Noted.	Resident
29		35		6.2	Residents Priorities	Suggests that a better process e.g. house to house survey was required.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		36		7.2	Reference Core Strategy	Believes unnecessary to quote Core Strategy commented throughout document.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		37		7.3/7.4	Vision Objectives	Supports .	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
29		37		7.6	Additional Info	Notes parameters of NDP but suggests that additional information should be represented elsewhere (e.g. appendices).	Noted add appendices.	Noted.	Resident
29		39		8.2	Evidence base	Asks where is evidence.	Noted See consultation raw data.	Noted.	Resident
29		41		8.10	Brickworks	Points out when live work units planning lapsed Jan 2018 status reverted to original warehouse permission which could still be implemented.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
29		41/42		7.9 to 7.20	BAUB	Unhappy that there was sufficient local consultation on BAUB. Notes that there is no local market or housing association land allocated within BAUB and asks where are we going to satisfy this need.	A revised BUAB for Napton was shown in the Proposed Site Allocations Plan, which was published by the District Council in August 2019 for consultation purposes. The Parish Council has suggested some minor amendments to this boundary. The submitted plan adopts a criteria based approach to any proposals for development coming forward.	Agree precise BUAB with SDC.	Resident
29		50		8.49	Policy 3 self build	Needs to include policy 2 affordable housing on rural exception sites as above.	The section on self build has been superceded by the emerging Site Allocations Plan, which was published for consultation purposes.	Revise the wording on self build in Section 8 in light of the emerging Site Allocations Plan (done)	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

29		51		8.54	Brickworks	Suggests (strongly) that a consultation on the site with the community needs to be repeated and updated. Supports NPC statement in 8.61.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		53		8.62	Brickworks/BUAB	As row 195, consideration of extended BUAB cannot be made unless community consulted.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		55		8.68	Policy 4 Business Development	Suggestions made for additional aims (see raw data).	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		56		8.72	Policy 5 Environmental	Suggests that environmental policy issues need to include good practice for current farming and local business as well as future proposals.	Noted (opinion).	Noted.	Resident
29		58		8.77	Policy 6 Heritage Assets	Suggests that main village Green should be revisited as conservation area.	Consideration by group local housing need land allocation.		Resident
29		59		8.84	Policy 7 Canals	Suggests there are additional opportunities to attract more visitors .	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
29		65		8.93	Policy 8 Green Spaces	Suggest grammatical change from allowed to supported.	noted change word.	Noted.	Resident
29		73		8.100	Important view and lanes	Supports important views but feels that it will be difficult to enforce, and suggest a shorter list chosen by public consultation.	Noted already completed.	13off views were selected then reduced down to 6 via a voting system of the NDP team, this is necessary as SDC will not accept more than 6 views.	Resident
29		78		8.11	Policy 13 Telecoms	Suggests that improvements have already been explored and some proposals reused by SDC planning.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
29		79-81		9.1-9.3	Traffic Mg	Suggest proper consultation as a future aspiration.	Group to discuss.	Not in scope of this document.	Resident
29		82		10.1 to 10.4	Action Plan	Suggests graded action plan to ensure NDP objective delivered and parish plan action plans are carried forward .	Unfortunately the Parish Plan carried no weight in decision making and is now regarded as out of date. It will be superceded by the Neighbourhood Development Plan, which will form part of the statutory development plan for the area.	No change	Resident
30	Yes	37		7.4	Safe & Suitable access	Endorses objective 8.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

30		38		7.7		Table 7 omits reference to objective 8.	Amend plan .	Document updated.	Resident
30		53		8.61 l	Safety	Endorses statement and reemphasises need for safety.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
30		79		9.6 & 9.7	Traffic management	Concern re safety (community aspirations section).	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
30		81			Pedestrian access to facilities	Concern that access to school is already an issue Community Aspirations.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31	No	4 and 5		Table 1	Consultation	Does not consider sufficient consultation was undertaken in advance of writing plan.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		16-Jan				Considers PM road development does not blend in.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		18		4.13	Character Assessment	Does not agree with character assessment.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		19		4.21	Street Lighting	Design of lights not always in keeping. Community aspirations section could address this.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		22		4.3		Does not make sense.	Review wording . No substantive change required.	No further action.	Resident
31		45		8.27 & 8.28		Does not agree with Inspector's comments re land above AC Lloyd Development.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		53		8.63 c	Business	Does not wish to see more caravan/camping/marinas.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		60		8.9	Local Green Space designation	Disagrees with need for LGS designation except for Sports Field .	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		61		Table 9	Description of sports field is inaccurate	Para to be amended (see hand written note).	Amend plan .	Plan amended to reflect correct terminology .	Resident
31		67		Important view 3	Inspectors comment	Inspector's comment has been misinterpreted.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31		73	9	Important views		Concerns about selection process for important views .	Noted. Process was rigorous.	No change needed.	Resident
31				Policy map 3		Considers inaccurate.	Noted.	Noted.	Resident
31	No				Consultation	Insufficient consultation undertaken to shape policies.	Noted. Details of consultation set out in plan but amend to explain more clearly opportunities for people to get involved.	Document amended.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

32					Parish Plan planning policies	Suggestion that 1.1 - 1.5 from PP be retained. These are Covered by Policy 1 in the emerging NDP with the exception of conservation area status for the village centre.	Unfortunately the Parish Plan carried no weight in decision making and is now out of date. A neighbourhood plan does not have the statutory power to designate a Conservation Area. Only SDC can do that.	No change required	
32					Conflicting policies	Policy 1b conflicts with 5.19.	Para 5.19 reflects some of the broader comments made by the Community as part of the Housing Needs Survey. Whilst such consultation provides important background information, the Neighbourhood Development Plan has a statutory requirement to conform to the Local Plan by, for example, allowing infill residential development within the BUAB.	No change required	Resident
32					Size of future developments	Suggests max 5 dwellings.	There is no justification for adopting a maximum of 5 dwellings. Why not 4 or 6 dwellings? There is no compelling evidence base to justify this policy stance.	No change required.	Resident
32					BUAB	Suggests development should be allowed outside BUAB .	Noted but no change - SDC policy.	No further action.	Resident
32					BUAB	Should be drawn around Chapel Green .	Noted but no change - NPC adopted BUAB proposed by SDC.	No further action.	Resident
32					Need for bungalows	States policy is needed .	Agreed - see Policy 1 re HNS.	Noted.	Resident
32			Policies 2 & 3			Suggests these duplicate SDC policies.	Policies 2 & 3 reflect SDC policies and need to be included in NDP. No change .	No further action.	Resident
32			Policy 4			Suggests these duplicate SDC policies.	Policies 4 is aligned with SDC policies and needs to be included in NDP. No change.	No further action.	Resident
32						Highways issues.	Noted but outside scope of the plan.	No further action.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

32			Policy 5			Policies need to be more specific to Napton .	Noted but policies provide a framework for responding to planning apps do reflect the character of the village.	Noted.	Resident
32			Policy 6				Policies 6 is aligned with SDC policies and needs to be included in NDP. No change.	No further action.	Resident
32			Policy 7			Concern re large canal developments .	Noted but policy 7 supported by CRT.	No further action.	Resident
32			Policy 8		LGS	Lack of clarity about level of protection designation gives.	Policy 8 sets out protection afforded by LGS status.	No further action.	Resident
32						Why is New Zealand Spinney excluded .	Too far from village.	No further action.	Resident
32						LGS should be shown on a map.	See policy map 2 .	No further action.	Resident
32			Policy 9		Views	Concern with selection criteria .	Consultation undertaken in May 18. Selection process was rigorous.	No change needed.	Resident
32			Policy 10		Lighting	Concern re increased lighting associated with business & tourism.	Noted .	Noted.	Resident
32			Policy 11			Concern with duplication of SDC policies.	Policies 11 is aligned with SDC policies and needs to be included in NDP. No change .	No further action.	Resident
32			Policy 12		Local services and community facilities	Policy should be more general & less specific.	Plan will be updated to reflect changes in local services .	Document updated.	Resident
32			Policy 13		Telecoms and infrastructure	Concern about location of broad band boxes .	Outside scope of plan.	No further action.	Resident
32						Policy in not sufficiently robust.	Noted no change required .	No further action.	Resident
32		79	Section 9		Community aspirations section	Respondent supports the inclusion of a Community Aspirations section and feels it should be included in the main body of the plan. Also states it should deal with bus routes and cycle ways.	Community Aspirations section deals with issues which do not specifically relate to land use or development matters.	Sections on traffic management and accessibility have been included in Community Aspirations section .	Resident
32						Add aspiration for cycle paths around village .	To be considered by group .	Included within Community Aspirations section.	Resident
32						Cycle paths to Stockton & Southam.	Outside scope of plan.	No further action.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

32						Bus timetable should be up to date.	In hand .	Hyperlink to up to date timetable to be included in plan.	Resident
32			Section 10			Suggests bi- annual review .	To be considered by group .	Monitoring and review section added .	Resident
33	No				Plan is too restrictive	Summarised as: This Development Plan does not reflect a forward progressive plan. To date, Napton has always adapted to change and incorporated development. The Plan is designed to stifle future development to the detriment of the village.	Noted.	Noted but no changes needed to the plan.	Resident
34		50		8.52		Encourages the development of the brown filed site at Napton Brickworks.	Noted.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
35	Yes	42/43		8.2		There will always be pressure to build outside the BUAB as the district council adopted the boundary on January 2018 any proposed incursions to this should be revisited.	Noted - All documents to be reviewed and where applicable updated with current versions at time of public consultation.	Review.	Resident
36	Yes		7.3		Vision	Excellent.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			7.4		Heritage Features	Great supporter, lived in Napton for nearly thirty years.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.3			Support a reasonable number of future houses.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.33		Affordable housing	Great my children had to leave the village.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.52		Brickyard	Good to see sympathetic development.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.67		Support for businesses and Local economy	Yes.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.68		Support for development related to recreation and tourism	Yes.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.73		Value of the historic environment	Yes.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.83		Importance of the canal network as a recreational asset	Yes.	Noted.	No action.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

36			8.100		Policy on important views	Yes.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			8.116		Support for improved electronic communications	Yes.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
36			9.4		Traffic management issues (to be tackled under community aspirations)	Good.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
37	Yes				BUAB	I'm in support of the 24 houses to be built within the BUAB area of the village between now and 2031 but surely there needs to be similar restrictions outside that boundary. If there are houses built on the Brickyard lane or behind the police house it would ,make a bit of a mockery of the careful limits for the main parts of the village.	Noted - Review as part of the BUAB review.	Latest version of NDP updated with the latest position regarding the Brickyard proposals, these are an ongoing action and will continue for many months more.	Resident
38	Yes					This is a very well constructed plan and worthy of the man hours pout into it. The history of Napton is very interesting and an important start to the plan. You can see the evolvement of the village. Hopefully the vision for Napton will be implemented and the community continue to thrive.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
39	Yes					Very thorough, carefully drawn up. Yes we need more houses for young, single, old people, affordable but we need to keep our green spaces and fields as well.	Noted.	No action.	Resident
40					BUAB	Concern about lack of consultation and origins of BUAB.	BUAB was proposed by SDC. NPC was advised no consultation with the community was needed. NPC debated the proposed alignment and voted to include the land above Quincy Meadow and the allotments, taking into consideration the criteria supplied by SDC.	Noted but no changes needed to the plan.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

40					BUAB	Because the allotments and land above Quincy Meadow are now within the BUAB they do not have protection from development .	Noted land above Quincy Meadow has now been designated as a proposed LGS. The allotments have less protection but are an important gap. If the allotment site were to be developed in the future the Parish Council would need to provide alternative land for allotments elsewhere.	Additional LGS proposed.	Resident
40					Important views	Concern about the objectivity of the process for choosing important views	The views were voted on by the group and considered against a set of criteria advised by our planning consultant.	The number of important views has been reduced on the advice of our planning consultant and as a result of a thorough review by the group .	Resident
40					Inclusion of Brickyard in BUAB	Suggests Brickyard development should be included within BUAB.	Plan will need to be amended to reflect NPC's decisions on this.	Await guidance from NPC.	Resident
40					Suggestion that NPC should identify sites for development	The decision was taken at the start of the process not to allocate any sites. The "call for sites" process is being dealt with by SDC.	Noted but no change required to the plan.	No further action.	Resident
40					Policy 1	This contains policies on residential development which the group feels are adequate to guide future development proposals .	Noted but no change required to the plan.	No further action.	Resident
40					Self build plots	Awaiting consultation from SDC.	Plan may need to be amended at a later date to reflect emerging policies from SDC.	Noted.	Resident
40					Character assessment	The plan should include Chapel Green in the CA.	Agreed. Although it sits outside the proposed BUAB, the character assessment ought to include a section on Chapel Green.	Amend character assessment to include Chapel Green (done)	Resident
40					Views and LGS	Comments re how these were selected.	Selection was based on criteria advised by government. NDP group discussed all proposals in detail.	Plan has been amended accordingly .	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

40					Highways impact of new developments	The traffic impact of any new developments will be considered at the time of application.	Primarily a highways issue but included in "aspirations" section.	Draw NPC attention to the importance of traffic issues.	Resident
40					Call for sites process	Concern over call for sites process.	This is responsibility of SDC .	Noted but no changes needed to the plan.	Resident
40					Conversion of barns to dwellings	Concerned that many barns seem to be converted to dwellings soon after being built.	Governed by COUQ policy within SDC Core strategy.	Noted but no changes needed to the plan.	Resident
40					Heritage features	Concern that these are not adequately covered.	Consultant advises the level of detail is sufficient.	Noted but no changes needed to the plan.	Resident
41	Yes	35				Question: Is there a reason why environmental, social and economic issues with wider impacts than only local cannot be listed here and then addressed in the objectives and policies section?	NDP is for local use only.	No action.	Resident
41		36-38		7.3		Wants greater emphasis on G270the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change [see Objective 4] • creating local sources of energy (electricity in the main) to reduce reliance on external sources [see Objective 4] • strengthening biodiversity / creating networks of green infrastructure [reword Objective 6] • new and existing buildings becoming more water and energy efficient [no objective and Objective 4] , and • avoiding the loss of good food growing land (domestic and commercial) [no Objective?] 	Noted - Housing needs survey conducted. Views of community already expressed.	No action.	Resident
41		37		7.4		Question: Do the objectives as set out suggest an order of priority of importance? Goes on to suggest changes to SOA Plan wording.	Noted but wording of SOA plan not within scope.	No action.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

41		39-78			Planning Policies	Question: Whether or not there is a reduction in overall need – should the Parish be planning to encourage additional smaller, much less costly and more adaptable homes (different household sizes and needs) within the plan period?	Brexit result not considered within SOA numbers therefore cannot be considered within NDP. Refer to page 29 for housing needs survey results.	No action.	Resident
41		46	1		Residential development	Suggested addition of following text i) it is designed to be adaptable to better meet the needs of both initial and future occupants (household size / ages) ii) it is designed and constructed enable the properties and residents to better cope with heatwaves and other extreme weather events.	Noted but wording of SOA plan not within scope.	Noted.	Resident
41					Affordable housing	Question term 'affordable housing' at 80% of market value : Other than a community minded land owner making this happen – is it possible for a commercial developer to be required to make land available for such purposes for a set number of years to see if it is taken up – and if not, then to allow it to be developed commercially? • Question: Could this be a route for a part or the entire former brickyard site?	Noted but out of scope of NDP.	No action.	Resident
41		56	5		environmental policy	Suggested additional points for SOA policy 5.	Noted but wording of SOA plan not within scope.	No action.	Resident
41					S106 monies	Question: Is it possible for S106 or community fund monies be used to support local community projects and initiatives?	Noted but out of scope of NDP.	No action.	Resident
42	N/A					Sport England refers to NPPF and the need for any new housing development to take account of the need to encourage informal recreation through walking, cycling etc .	Noted . NDP aligns with NPPF requirements.	Noted.	Sport England
43	N/A					National Grid say they are unaffected by the plan.		Noted.	National Grid
44	Yes			3.13	Use of canals	Not just for recreation. Many people live on boats.	Noted no change required.	No further action.	Resident
44		18		4.13	Housing development names - factual correction	Refer to PM road development as Cyril's Corner and Collins Close.		Doc amended to reflect comment.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

46	Yes		11			Supportive of policies on trees and hedgerows but requests stronger protection of mature trees and woodland when considering planning apps.	Discuss strengthen policy 11 with the group.	Doc amended to include mature trees.	Woodland Trust
47	N/A				Transport matters	Any proposals will need to be self funding and within highway criteria.	Noted no action required.	No further action.	Warwickshire County Council
47					Public Health	Health and well being theme in the plan is supported .	Noted no action required.	No further action.	Warwickshire County Council
47					Flood risk	Technical flood management issues for future development proposals.	Noted but outside the scope of the NDP.	No further action.	Warwickshire County Council
47						Plan should include detailed specifications for dealing with domestic water management.	Responsibility of LPA.	None required.	Warwickshire County Council
48	N/A					"Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan." Letter ref 269201.	See comment. Referred us to an attached annexe with generic considerations.	No action.	Natural England
49	Yes					Supportive of use of historic characterisation to develop well thought out policies.	No action .	No further action.	Historic England
50	n/a				Canals	Supportive of policies 7 & 9. Additional comments made on the Brickyard Development proposals but which are not part of this.	No action.	No further action.	Canal and Rivers Trust
51	yes	42			BUAB	Supports BUAB.	No action .	No further action.	Resident
51		44			Character assessment	Advocates use of stone in new build. An supports traditional styles.	Noted. Design guidance will follow publication of plan. No action at this stage.	No further action.	Resident
51		45		8.27	Land above AC Lloyd	Must be kept free of development.	Noted.	Land has been proposed as a Local Green Space.	Resident
51		66		8.99	important view 1	Request for view or be extended.	Noted. Group to consider .	Group decided view 1 was less significant than the others and so it was removed.	Resident
51		73		8.11	Important views	Supports all proposed important views .	Noted. No action needed.	No further action.	Resident

APPENDIX 7 - List of consultee representations made at Reg.14

52	Yes	19		4.2	Green Lanes & Hollow ways	Further importance to be given to protecting these.		Highways are responsible for the protection and management of green lanes BUT Fells Lane is identified as important in several section so the plan.	Napton Parish Council
52		61		8.92	Local green spaces	Suggests inclusion of Grantown PF clarify which areas .	Discuss with the group .	No action .	Napton Parish Council
52					Chapel Green	Should hamlet be recognised with it's own identity?		Document updated with reference to Chapel green.	Napton Parish Council
52		79		9	Community aspirations	This needs to include design guidance doc to sit alongside plan .	Discuss with the group .	To be referred to NPC at a later date.	Napton Parish Council
53	Yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
54	Yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
55	Yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
56	Yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
57	Yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
58	Yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
59		42	Policy map 1	8.18	BUAB	Wishes to see change to BUAB.	Noted. Outside the scope of the plan .	No further action.	Diocesan Board
60	yes					No other comments made .		No further action.	Resident
61	Yes			8.99	Important views	Desire to see view 1 retained within the plan.	All views have been reconsidered and view 1 was removed as it was deemed a lower priority and was less likely to be supported by the planning inspector .	No change required.	Resident
62						Detailed comments received in respect of proposed local green space at Napton Brickworks.	Review accuracy of information on LGS .	Boundary of proposed LGS amended to include most sensitive wildlife areas.	Resident