

# **Stevington Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Responses**



**February 2020**

## Contents

Approach to Comments Review	3
Actions Summary	4
Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020	5
Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019	14

## Approach to Comments Review

During the consultation processes the Parish Council received a small number of responses that had a considerable amount of detail within them. The PC has looked to extract the salient comments and ensure that they are represented within this response document. We have not looked to reproduce the correspondence in long form for the analysis and response section, as this would make the document prohibitively large to manage and review, but have opted to extract specific questions or statements made where it was felt a response was expected.

### Analysis

All comments have been reviewed and an initial recommendation has been made with respect to each, as a general guide they have been categorised as follows:

- Review comment or comments relate to a section that the PC feel should be reviewed based on the feedback received
- Task comment requires an action from the PC, this would cover suggested updates to the plan document or specific personal responses to comments etc
- Edit comment on the plan format, correction to spelling or clarity of meaning etc
- Option suggestion made to expand upon or add additional detail to the plan
- None comment is either a statement of fact, opinion or raises a question that has been explained under the rational/response heading

### Process

After initial analysis the document was anonymised and circulated for reviewed by the Parish Council for accuracy and agreement to the rational and/or individual responses proposed. A final edit of the document was then produced before it was submitted to our planning consultant for review and comment. The finalised document has been submitted as a supporting document to the Inspector, and has been made available on the dedicated website for public review.

Although anonymised, correspondent numbering has been kept consistent between each Consultation phase so, for example, any comments made by Correspondent #1 on the July 2019 response table would be from the same individual(s) with respect to any response comments detailed on the Jan 2020 table.

### Note

**This document is designed to provide specific responses to individual comments raised during the NDP consultation processes, although it is being used to help refine and update the final plan document prior to Regulation 16 submission, none of the responses enclosed form part of the NDP document or should be used in the interpretation of the Plan. The NDP provides the form of all Policies and is the only guide to their interpretation for applicants and/or the LPA.**

Actions Summary Second Consultation Phase		Responses
Discussion	Inclusion of brownfield sites (expand HO3 to include)	1
	Edit/reduction of Section 4	1
	Addition of an Aspiration section including S106 comment	1
	Remove list of CWS and SSSI's	1
	Holy Well - replace 'international significance' (as no designation exists) with 'site of pilgrimage' instead	1
	Parish location - heading is within Borough, includes detail of MK and East of England	1
	DC - Policy TI2 (connectivity to Pavements) - clarification as connection where current footpaths exist?	4
	Addition of a new Policy DH3 to reflect Archaeological interest	1
	Inclusion of Site D as LGS (Thomas Beazley's response)	1
	DC - Policy DH1 - suitable access for all clarification	1
	DC - Policy HO2 - condition of restricting expansion of current dwellings	1
	Add Policy Map	1
	Additional detail of first consultation (covered within the main Consultation Statement)	2
Information inserts	Expand on evidencing for Housing Mix (H02)	1
	Insert new Policy DH3 to reflect Archaeological interest	2
	Revise wording to section 4.2.14 to reflect changes to LGS section	1
Review	Local Plan 2030 references	11
	NPPF 2019 references	3
Document revisions	Format, spelling or punctuation changes	26
	Wording updates or simple text relocations	15
No Further Action	Statements and/or Questions asked but requiring no revision to the Plan	32
		108

Actions Summary First Consultation Phase		Responses
Discussion	Local Green Space	36
	LPA recommended or minor policy wording change	15
	Local Plan 2030 references	2
	LGS inclusion within the Plan Body	1
	Capacity Report	1
	NPPF reference update	1
	Format, spelling or punctuation changes	10
Document revisions	Narrative updates or simple text amends	48
No Further Action	Statements and/or Questions asked but requiring no revision to the Plan	280
Carried Forward Actions	Support document creation etc	3
		397 (please see note)
<b>Note:</b> Although it would appear that a significant number of response comments were received it should be noted that the majority (251 or 63%) were raised by just two individuals who (openly) collaborated on their responses before submitting their comments. The number of responses is therefore disproportionately higher than would normally be expected where average (non-LPA comment) was 4-5 comments per person or 1.2%		

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020											
Name	Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status		
Bedford Borough Council	001	MK42 9AP	Whole document	As mentioned in previous comments, there is no need to repeat sections from the NPPF or indeed whole Local Plan policies. Where they have been repeated and if you choose to keep them in, please check they are the most up to date version. There are some out of date references and we have tried to pick them up but we recommend that they are all checked.	Review & Edit	Major - NPPF check/update	Document Edit - NPPF reference updated as noted	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	Confirm scope to Tricia and Jane as some sections still contain LP section references	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	002	MK42 9AP	Whole document	Every section refers to 'Local policy' – each section needs to be updated to reflect the adoption of Local Plan 2030, the deletion of all Core Strategy & Rural Issues Policies – and references to other policies need to be checked to ensure that they are saved (and have not been deleted).Checking is needed throughout the document. We attach Appendix 1 of the LP 2030 which lists each policy and whether it is replaced, saved or deleted. Perhaps if you explain the policy context in 6.0.1 which is at the start of the policies section of the Neighbourhood Plan you could remove the repeated Local policy sections from each of the individual policy themes?	Review & Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - updated with LP and AD references from LP 2030	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	Create a reference section in 6.0.1 that details the strategic Policies checked/confirmed from the Local Plan	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	003	MK42 9AP	Whole document	Include details of source documents in the appendix – eg. Road survey and SPA capacity report.	Review & Edit	Minor - Insert	Document Edit - Road Survey detail moved to Appendix, Capacity Report will be submitted as a supporting document	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	004	MK42 9AP	Section 4	Whilst the content of your plan is up to you, Section 4 is quite long and most of it is irrelevant particularly as the pertinent sections from it are repeated in each policy interpretation section.	Review	Section 4	Document Edit (Section 4)	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	Pending review of suggested Section edit	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	005	MK42 9AP	All Policies	In all cases, the NP policies would be most useful to the user if the bullet points were numbered/lettered criteria as this makes the individual parts of the policies easier to reference.	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	** Keith edit request ** New DH3 add numbered bullet points to second and third sentences	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	006	MK42 9AP	Whole document	Whilst we appreciate that you have numbered the sections of the plan, as mentioned previously, numbering paragraphs would be most useful to the user and the examiner.	Review	Policy Format	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	** Keith edit request **	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	007	MK42 9AP	All Policies	Perhaps consider making the non-policy boxes a different colour to the policy boxes – e.g. at 9.4 the vision.	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	008	MK42 9AP	1.1	Introduction – 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point 'policies' not 'polices'.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	009	MK42 9AP	1.1	5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> paragraphs references to the emerging Local Plan need to be updated.	Review & Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	010	MK42 9AP	3	5 <sup>th</sup> para 'looks' should be 'look'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	011	MK42 9AP	Page 12 map	This policies map will be changed as a result of the Local Plan 2030 adoption. It is recommended that this map is included here.	Review	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - additional information needed		Check with BBC if there is a revised Policy map for Stevington?	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	012	MK42 9AP	4.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence remove comma after 'It is'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	013	MK42 9AP	4.3.2	The information about the regions isn't relevant and the section heading is <b>Stevington's location within Bedford Borough</b> .	Review & Edit	Minor - Review	Document Edit - updated with new narrative as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	014	MK42 9AP	4.3.4	'South East Midlands Sub-Region' not 'Milton Keynes and the South Midlands'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative revised as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	015	MK42 9AP	4.3.6	Last paragraph, The East of England Development Agency no longer exists.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	016	MK42 9AP	4.3.10	Describing the Holy Well as of "international significance" is misleading from a heritage perspective as it is of national significance given its grade II listing. Could be changed to simply "site of pilgrimage" or alternative which does not use the word 'significance'.	Review & Edit	Minor - Review	Document Edit - updated with new narrative as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	016a	MK42 9AP	Page 21	Describing the Holy Well as of "international significance" is misleading from a heritage perspective as it is of national significance given its grade II listing. Could be changed to simply "site of pilgrimage" or alternative which does not use the word 'significance'.	None	Duplicate Comment	No Further Action Required - duplicates comment #016	Action taken under comment #016 above		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	017	MK42 9AP	Page 26	<i>Residents acknowledged that the Parish has a significant number of listed and historic structures and expressed a strong desire to protect and enhance these assets and their siting</i> – should be 'settings'.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	018	MK42 9AP	Page 26	<i>'The windmill was identified as the predominate symbol for the village and as such should have specific protection to ensure that it remains as a working example of the village's heritage'</i> . This is listed as Grade II* and so already enjoys a high statutory designation. This can be included at page 19 where the windmill is discussed. Agreed however that retaining its functionality long term would be of great benefit to the windmill.	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - updated with new narrative as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	019	MK42 9AP	5.1	A brief explanation of why the consultation ran for 13 weeks would be helpful.	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - consultation section has been expanded to provide more detail on the process followed, events etc	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	020	MK42 9AP	5.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> para adding 2019 after April would be useful clarification.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	021	MK42 9AP	5.2	Could usefully include a summary of the outcomes from the 2019 consultation.	Edit	Major - include in Consultation statement	Document Edit - consultation section has been expanded to provide more detail and will include outcomes of both consultation phases	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	022	MK42 9AP	Section 6 Policies	This whole section needs to be updated as a result of the adoption of the Local Plan 2030.	Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	023	MK42 9AP	Section 6 Policies	6.0.4 Strategic policies are now the AD policies you already have listed on page 31 (except AD25) plus the strategic policies in LP2030 which are listed in Appendix 2 of LP2030 (attached). The Core Strategy and Rural Issues Plan has been deleted.	Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - updated with LP and AD references from LP 2030	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	024	MK42 9AP	7.2.1	NPPF paragraph number has not been updated	Edit	Major - NPPF check/update	Document Edit - NPPF reference updated as noted		Pending review of suggested Section edit	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	025	MK42 9AP	7.3.1	9 <sup>th</sup> paragraph BBC Planning Department 'has' confirmed not 'have'.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	026	MK42 9AP	7.3.1	11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> paragraphs update in relation to adopted LP2030.	Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	027	MK42 9AP	Policy HO1	3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet – should this be 'functional' instead of functioning garden spaces, but it would also be useful to explain what this means in the policy instead of the text	Edit	Minor - Edit & Updated needed	Document Edit - narrative revised as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	028	MK42 9AP	Policy HO1	4 <sup>th</sup> bullet, 'having' not 'has'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	029	MK42 9AP	Policy HO1	5 <sup>th</sup> bullet no capital to be consistent with the other criteria.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	030	MK42 9AP	7.5	HO1 Interpretation section, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, Policy DH1 not DH01.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	031	MK42 9AP	Policy H02	It would be useful to explain either in the policy or interpretation section as to where the evidence for this type of housing has come from. Has there been a Housing Needs Survey conducted?	Review & Edit	Minor - update based on response comment to Consult 1	Document Edit - additional information needed		Pending review of suggested Section edit	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	032	MK42 9AP	Policy H02	The interpretation section states that consideration will be made to imposing conditions on restricting the extension of new dwellings. This should be in a policy and should clearly state when this would occur.	Review	Major - Policy check needed	Document Edit - additional information not required		UVE Question	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	033	MK42 9AP	Policy HO3	– add full stop at the end.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	034	MK42 9AP	Policy HO3	An additional bullet point could also be added in the policy and not the interpretation section as follows: "Evidence being provided to demonstrate that the building(s) is redundant for agricultural or commercial purposes."	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	035	MK42 9AP	Policy H03 and H04	As well as the significance of surrounding heritage schemes'. 'Schemes' should read assets.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	036	MK42 9AP	Policy H03 and H04	Clarify what is suitable services and transport infrastructure in the policy. Suggest that this is change to 'suitable infrastructure being in place to support the new residential dwellings'.	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed	
Bedford Borough Council	037	MK42 9AP	8.2.1	Planning Practice Guidance is continuously updated so we suggest you remove the date (2014)	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed	



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name		Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status
Bedford Borough Council	038	MK42 9AP	8.2.2	As above update references to local policy.	Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	039	MK42 9AP	8.2.2	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph CSRIP has been replaced by LP2030.	Review & Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	040	MK42 9AP	8.2.2	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph this is now Policy 41S.	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	041	MK42 9AP	Page 43, first paragraph	Amend 'grade 1 listed building' to 'grade I' for the Church.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	042	MK42 9AP	Policy DH1	Last dot point - Clarification needed as to what is defined as 'suitable access for people of all abilities'. Does this mean for wheelchairs to get into the dwellings or access to the site?	Review & Edit	Major - Policy check needed	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended to provide additional detail	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	043	MK42 9AP	Policy DH1	A bullet point could also be added to the policy as follows "preserving or enhancing the special interest of the CA as well as the significance of heritage assets".	Review & Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	044	MK42 9AP	Policy DH2	Be consistent with capital letters.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	045	MK42 9AP	Policy DH2	The policy focusses heavily on built heritage assets of architectural or historic interest. However, it should also be explained that heritage assets can be of archaeological interest (above and below-ground remains) and the point made that any development should look to avoid, minimise and mitigate impacts upon these. If harm is justified, then the negative impacts on aspects of significance should be offset by enhancing others through recording, disseminating and archiving archaeological and historical interest of the important elements of the heritage assets affected.	None	Policy Review - advice received is that these changes may not meet the basic conditions and would be more restrictive than the current Local Plan 2030	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	046	MK42 9AP	DH2 Interpretation	Delete this sentence as it is not considered necessary in this paragraph. ' <i>Heritage assets can be of archaeological interest (above &amp; below ground remains) and any development should avoid, minimise &amp; mitigate impacts on these</i> '.	None	Policy Review - advice received is that these changes may not meet the basic conditions and would be more restrictive than the current Local Plan 2030	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	047	MK42 9AP	New policy	It is suggested that a new policy is included after DH2 to cover heritage assets of archaeological interest, as follows: 'Stevington has a significant amount of archaeological interest, and much of it is not designated. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, developers will be required in the first instance to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation to inform a planning decision. Where development is consented and would lead to the loss of significance of a heritage asset, the developer will be required to record that loss and make the results of this work publicly accessible.'	None	Policy Review - advice received is that these changes may not meet the basic conditions and would be more restrictive than the current Local Plan 2030	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	048	MK42 9AP	New policy	It is suggested that the Interpretation for this policy reads as follows: 'The archaeology of the area is documented through the Bedford Borough Historic Environmental Record; this cites over 64 sites and finds in the Parish. The quantity and spread of remains date from prehistoric times to the present day across the Parish indicate that any proposed development may disturb archaeological material. Development presents a great opportunity for further understanding of the area's cultural heritage and any information and material gained will further enhance an understanding of the Parish and its links with the wider world. This policy will ensure that new development takes account of the rich archaeological heritage of the parish by ensuring suitable archaeological investigations are undertaken where required.'	None	Policy Review - advice received is that these changes may not meet the basic conditions and would be more restrictive than the current Local Plan 2030	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	049	MK42 9AP	9.2.1	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph and 7 <sup>th</sup> paragraph NPPF references are out of date.	Edit	Major - NPPF check/update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated to current NPPF wording	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	050	MK42 9AP	9.2.2	As mentioned above check all of the policy numbers.	Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	051	MK42 9AP	Page 51	Second paragraph – amend sentence to 'Paragraphs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 of the Bedford Borough Green Space Strategy....'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	052	MK42 9AP	Policy EN1	Be consistent with capital letters.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	053	MK42 9AP	Policy EN1	1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point 'such as hedges'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	054	MK42 9AP	Policy EN1	5 <sup>th</sup> bullet point – instead of listing all of the County Wildlife Sites, it may be better to state 'particular regard will be made to impacts on local and national designated sites and sites which contain priority habitats and species.'	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative revised as recommended, CWS and SSSI list removed to Interpretation section	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	055	MK42 9AP	Policy EN1	The first sentence of the 6 <sup>th</sup> dot point is a repeat of the 5 <sup>th</sup> dot point.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	056	MK42 9AP	Page 53	Interpretation – third paragraph. Remove the words 'to determine value to local residents' as it is the purpose of a tree survey to determine the value of the tree and not the local residents as it could be that the tree is unsafe, dead or diseased and deemed unsuitable in that location.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	057	MK42 9AP	Page 54	Change the colour of the box under section 9.4 as it is the same colour as the policies, which is confusing to the reader.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	058	MK42 9AP	Map on page 56	Add a title – and where is this referenced in the text?	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative revised as suggested, yitle added, reference is with respect to the strategic local views section on P57	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	059	MK42 9AP	9.4.2	It would be more useful to have section 9.4.2 under the policy to explain the local green spaces.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative revised as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	060	MK42 9AP	Policy CF1	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph add full stop	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	061	MK42 9AP	Page 64	CF1 rationale 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph – perhaps spell out in full NDHA 'non-designated heritage asset' instead of the abbreviation.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	062	MK42 9AP	11.2.2	As above update all of the local policy section. Paragraphs 6 and 7 re. CPRE – consider referencing LP2030 Policy 37 Landscape Character as this would probably more relevant than the CPRE comments on the draft Local Plan 2035.	Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - narrative revised as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	063	MK42 9AP	11.2.2	Paragraph 11 - the reference to parking SPD is out of date. Parking Standards for Sustainable Communities SPD was adopted in 2014.	Edit	Minor - edit & check reference	Document Edit - narrative revised as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	064	MK42 9AP	11.2.2	Paragraph 13 – The SuDS SPD was adopted in 2018.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	065	MK42 9AP	11.2.3	The road survey and other evidence should be included as background evidence to the plan and available for viewing.	None	Statement Only	Document Edit - narrative sections relocated as recommended (now in Appendix A)	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Bedford Borough Council	066	MK42 9AP	Policy TI1	First sentence – delete the word of – "In considering planning applications for new development of or the intensification of development, particular regard will be made to ensuring that:"	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - format/spelling/punctuation	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name		Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status
Bedford Borough Council	067	MK42 9AP	Policy TI2	2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet – what if there is no existing pavement or the existing pavement is some distance away? Suggest adding the word 'where appropriate' to the end of this sentence.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	068	MK42 9AP	12.2.2	Policy 78 is now Policy 75.	Edit	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - narrative updated as recommended	Revision completed - v5 February 2020	NA	Completed
Correspondent #9	069	MK43 7PF	Whole document	I still think it is unreasonable to state that consultation had taken place with the landowners who are not residents of the parish, via their retrospective Parish Councils. I think it would have been much more effective to have written to those affected, but I appreciate the opportunity for that has now passed.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The Parish Council initiated the second consultation in part to address concerns over landowner consultation of the proposed LGS sites, all of the landowner's potentially impacted by Local Green Space designation were contacted directly by the Parish Council to highlight the potential impact of the NDP and LGS designation at the start of the consultation period with a follow-up email sent on 20th Jan 2020 as a reminder prompt for responses		Completed
Correspondent #9	070	MK43 7PF	Whole document	Thank you for acknowledging the point. I note that you state that the NDP does not have to identify specific sites. I do not disagree with this sentiment, except as you have identified a local requirement of 11-15 new houses during the plan period, is there not a rationale for identifying the villagers preferred sites providing they fit into the objectives and policies laid out in the plan?	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The aspiration for the NDP is to deliver 11-15 homes over the Plan period, this is underpinned by the evidence of the Capacity Report provided by Urban Vision that shows that a mix of current SPA development and potential redundant building conversions can meet this desire. Recent planning applications for development include 5 such conversions on farm land in Court Lane, for example, seem to support our evidence that this approach can deliver our 'target'		Completed
Correspondent #9	071	MK43 7PF	Whole document	Note plan is revised, thank you. The submission was to formerly record that permission had been obtained under permitted development rights for conversion to residential. Having studied the NDP, I think that a new submission for residential would comply with the wishes of the NDP but it is important to record that a permission existed prior to the commencement of the NDP period.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Noted, and thank you for the confirmation. We would agree that a new submission would fit within the aims of the NDP.		Completed
Correspondent #9	072	MK43 7PF	Whole document	<p>I am afraid I still have issues with the green spaces aspect of your revised plan, especially with regard to Green space D. I think we all have the same ambition for the long term future of the countryside in and surrounding the beautiful village of Stevington. I think your ambition to preserve all the views as part of your plan is unrealistic, you should not be trying to preserve the countryside in aspic as the National Trust attempt to do, the countryside is a working environment that has evolved over the years and will continue to evolve with or without the NDP. You currently have a government who, as a result of Brexit, is carrying out a review of agriculture support and evaluating how any future support can assist the countryside with its environmental initiative whilst helping reduce the countries carbon pollution. Without getting into the pro and cons with the emerging ideas emanating from Westminster at present, I think it is certain that a national tree planting campaign will be part of the plan. This may take the form of new woodland planting, small spinneys and copses or agroforestry, all of which will have a profound effect on the views and vista currently enjoyed by village residents, mostly positive but never the less it will interfere with your desire to preserve current views.</p> <p>With specific reference to Stevington Belt. This belt of trees was planted when Oakley House was remodelled in the end of the 1700's. Unfortunately it was planted for an effect sooner rather than later, as a result the Oaks are mainly Turkey oaks rather than English and currently reaching the end of their natural life. This compounded by Chalara effecting the Ash and climate change doing the same for the Beech, without serious intervention the future is extremely bleak for the spinney and the Roundel in the field centre. These trees are all protected under existing tree protection orders, are all part of our farm woodland scheme administered by the Forestry Commission and are part of our overall woodland policy advised on by woodland tree specialists Lockhart &amp; Garratt, therefore do not need the protection of the NDP. The long term plans for the belt will be seriously undermined by your NDP desire to create landscape views alongside it and may well effect the chance of securing long term funding to help secure the future of the belt.</p> <p>You have my assurance that I wish to see the Parkland preserved for future generations but please give consideration as to the likely implications of the NDP in hampering preservation rather than assisting it.</p>	Review	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The Parish Council have discussed the local Green Space submiision and agreed that it would still be relevant to look to list this land as LGS given it's popularity with the residents for recreational value and history. We don't believe that listing the land as local green space would adversely effect the management of the woods and whilst we are fully assured and accept that the current owner will manage the land with its best interests in mind we feel the additional protection the LGS designation would afford will help ensure it remains a valued LGS for generations to come irrespective of future ownership of the site.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	073	MK43 7QU	Whole document	1. Thank you all for your revisions to the SNP1 Plan published in April 2019. Your changes to, and removal of, several proposed Local Green Spaces are welcomed, together with additions and clarification of Housing Policy and rationale, and other amendments. Thank you also for your hard work that has clearly gone into the revised plan.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Thank you for you kind comments.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	074	MK43 7QU	Whole document	2. Once again, I make a genuine offer to help, this time to proof read any further version of this plan, or check for cross referencing and follow on changes egg other wordings that may need changing in other parts of the plan after a revision of one part. I would NOT change the wording but list any possible relevant changes, typos etc.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Thank your offer is noted, we would welcome help in proof reading the final document ahead of submission to the Inspector and will reach out to you nearer the time.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	075	MK43 7QU	Whole document	3. As the Development Plan for Stevington this should meet current and future development requirements so as to encourage the development of the village and the parish in such a way as to sustain the village, to provide some future employment, social facilities, healthy environments and homes. There is a presumption for development in the NPPF. There should be a balance to protect the uniqueness of Stevington and its heritage, while at the same time encourage development to economically and socially sustain and enhance the village and the Parish to enable Stevington and its community to survive and grow. We believe Stevington PC continues to miss the opportunities to include more for development, instead the Plan continues to put restriction on the development of existing and new dwellings, possible new tourist attractions, new businesses and possible new facilities. Should the Plan not contain new ideas and aspirations for new social facilities, new healthy living facilities, new uses of brown field sites, and importantly as a development plan show where there could be development, for example as detailed in the Capacity report that the PC commissioned as part of this process?	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The NDP is not permitted to apply more restrictive controls on development than local and national Policy. The purpose of this NDP is primarily to support sustainable and appropriate development that is in line with the village needs and sensitive to its scale and heritage. Policies have been included that look to support current and future business opportunities, however, it was not considered appropriate to look to identify business sites as there was no evidence from the feedback received that there was any such demand or likelihood of delivery. All Policies have been developed with the support and feedback from the residents and business owners in the Parish and look to reflect the consensus opinion.		Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name	Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status	
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	076	MK43 7QU	DH2 Policy	4. DH2 : Non-Designated Heritage Assets The policy looks good, thank you. The phase is also used in your policy H03. In order to assist in planning decisions for development PLEASE include an explanation or a definition of Non-designated Heritage Assets in DH2. Possibly referring to paras 197-199 in the NPPF 2019 No 197 The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. No 198 Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred. No 199 Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	We have revised the DH2 section in line with the recommendation made by Bedford Borough Council who will be the responsible body for implementing and interpreting the NDP when made, please see comments #44 to 48 above which should address the concerns raised here, the NDP isn't looking to create it's own designated for NDHA this would be done by the LPA when considering any planning application.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	077	MK43 7QU		4. Where are your plans and programs to promote a healthier life style? Why not take an idea out of the Borough Local Plan to "recognise, safeguard and encourage the role of allotments; garden plots within developments; small scale agriculture and farmers markets in providing access to healthy, affordable locally produced food options." (BBC 2030 adopted local Plan policy P2S, iv). Maybe a market is a step too far, but the rest would be a valuable inclusion in the SNP.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The NDP is at the foremost a planning document, the creation of a local market could be included as a village aspiration but would not be a planning matter. Likewise the creation of allotments was considered during the Plan creation process but it did was not an item that demonstrated particular support during the public engagement activities so was not prioritised for the NDP. (A previous exercise to investigate the viability of allotments also failed to gain enough support to progress, though obviously this can be investigated further by the Parish Council should this become a priority for the village again). The issues regarding functioning garden space are covered within Policies HO1, HO4 and DH1.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	078	MK43 7QU		5. There is still no policy on the use of Section 106 agreements or similar planning gains that could be sought on future development proposals for the village. Why doesn't the plan list aspirational plans for the betterment of the parish, may be a developer could contribute to this. What does the Village want? This was partly answered in your meetings and questionnaires. Why not seek a new farm shop, provide allotments, help pay for a future traffic scheme, provide land for off road car parking, help build a better Village Hall. All that is mentioned is the 11-15 small starter homes or retirement houses. There could be much more direction as to such ideas in the Plan to give guidance on what might be done to socially and economically sustain the Parish. In your Excel spreadsheet on responses, there is still a line in Pink that says you will pick up S106 issues and ideas in the second phase. Where is this and is it still to be consulted on and included in the final version of the Plan that goes forward for examination? When will there be a chance for us to comment on it?	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Section 106 was discussed as part of the previous review processes and was added to a discussion list with our plan consultant, hence it remained outstanding for a while after the initial results of the first consultation were published. Whilst free to identify village aspirations within the Plan to highlight possible village improvements, we were acutely aware that this would require further consultation with the residents and potentially further delay the Plan publication. Given the limited opportunity to access S106 monies and availability of other sources of grant income it was felt that aspirational items could be managed by the PC outside of the NDP process, as even if included they would have no legal weight in decision making. It should also be noted that the majority of the items mentioned in the response comment have already been considered by the Parish Council recently, or are actively managed through the current precept, for example a review of the viability of replacing or renovating the current village hall was concluded in 2019, traffic improvements are ongoing with the current enhancements to the centre of the village and new mobile speed awareness signs being other initiatives for 2020, allotments (covered under comment #077), on and off road parking are under review at the moment for example.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	079	MK43 7QU		6. No Doubt further amendments to this document will need to be made in light of approval and adoption by Bedford Borough Council on the 20th Jan 2020 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030, which now becomes the main planning document for Bedford Borough Council and the Local Planning Authority. There are various references throughout the SNP to this Local Plan, some of the points have changed their wording, and policies have changed numbers and have been amended. a) In particular there are various points and details that require amendment to the adopted policies and definitions on the SNP pages 35 and 36, for example to change references to BBC Local Plan Policy 6, and Policy 7S, and to ensure that you use the Borough definition for Stevington as a "Smaller Settlement" (adopted BBC Local Plan 2020 paragraph 6.19) and not as a Small Settlement as SNP does on page 36 - currently -"Stevington has been designated a Small Settlement in the emerging BBC Local Plan 2030" it should read "Stevington has been designated a Smaller Settlement in the adopted BBC Local Plan 2030".	Review & Edit	Major - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	080	MK43 7QU	HO3	7. Brown field site are still mentioned and then not referred to specifically. There are still some possible brown field sites in the SPA as well as others outside. In H03, the Policy requires the proposal involving permanent structure, why not extend this to include brown field sites? So instead point one could be "the proposal involving a permanent structure and or a brown field site". It would not have to be an either or, although maybe that would help to tidy up certain Brown field sites in the Parrish.	Review	Minor Review - consider update as suggested?	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	As the NDP doesn't look to allocate or identify specific development sites it didn't seem logical to then identify just brownfield sites within the SPA either. Providing any new brownfield development proposal meets the conditions of the LP and NDP then it would very likely be supported anyway.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	081	MK43 7QU		8. Please can there be amendments to the wording of paragraph 4.2.14 Green Spaces - There has been no update to the three paragraphs in this section since the last version, although there have been significant changes in the plan. Hopefully the section should reflect those changes, and the revised position.	Review	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - Local Green Space section has been reviewed and the narrative revised as needed	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name	Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action	Comment?	Task Status
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	082	MK43 7QU		9. Review by PC on the 1st Consultation Summer 2019 We are saddened to see that some of our previous comments and suggestions were not taken up. That is life. We also feel that at times the summarised comments and the PC's remarks were disingenuous and would appear to have missed the reasoning's and points made and do not explain why the PC feels their point is more valid. There are a few items in pink that have yet to be decided on, the sheet refers to the second consultation phase. When and how will any changes brought about by this second consultation phase be available for comments and suggested revisions?	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	All comments received for both consultations will be reviewed and where appropriate further amendments will be made to the final Plan, this completes Regulation 14. The revised document will then be submitted to BBC for further review and then assuming they agree it meets the basic conditions will be passed for independent inspection. There is no further public consultation until the plan is published under regulation 16, unless deemed neccasary by the Inspector, the Inspector will, however, check to ensure that all comments made during the Consultation phase have been reviewed subjectively and that the Plan has been revised accordingly.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	083	MK43 7QU		10. Is the plan Future proofed? Are H01 and H02 going to be too restrictive in the future? No one knows what might happen, and whether we need other types of dwellings. Should there be a built-in review, either based on time or new circumstances which should require a new housing survey, which may or may not lead to a restatement of Housing and Development policies and numbers.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Please see the Introduction, Governance section of the NDP for more detail - the Parish Council will actively review the NDP every 5 years throughout its duration specifically to ensure it is delivering to the stated Aims, if required then a review will be triggered and amended Plan will be proposed if appropriate		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	084	MK43 7QU		11. For reasons highlighted before The Methodist chapel in Park Road which has not been a place of worship since the early part of the last century, was used in the rural community as a farm building, then a grain and then potato store and since 1979 an organ builder's workshop until 2013. It was only used as a shop / jewellery workshop for 4 years. It closed in 2017 when the business closed down. It has only had 4 years when the public had access, even though not cleared through planning. It was still a workshop, in the eyes of the local Planning authority, without any change of use. No one is prepared to take it on, as evidenced by the interest shown when it was up for rent in the last 3 years. We as a parish do not want to see it empty. It is better to save a building and ensure it survives, and if it is a house, in a part of the village dominated by houses, retaining all its historic characteristics, then surely that would be better for the building and the village. Please take it out of your list of Community Facilities. It is a misnomer.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The inclusion of the Chapel as a Community Facility was based on feedback from the village and evidenced within the questionnaire, it should be noted, however, that Policy CF1 allows for redevelopment where it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer required.		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	085	MK43 7QU	Policy T12	12. Pavements Policy T12 New dwellings must... "Front an existing pavement or include provision of a new section of pavement linking to the wider pavement network." Please can you clarify that this just applies to any new dwelling development within the SPA? There are virtually no Pavements outside the SPA. a) Does the "pavement network" include just those on the same side of the road or also those across the road from a proposed development. Please can you clarify this in the plan. b) The plan frequently mentions the uniqueness of Stevington, particularly it's historic setting and heritage. The lack of pavement is part of that uniqueness. Church Road has no pavements where it meets the other roads at the Cross. It would be too narrow if pavements were put in on both sides. To "link to the wider pavement network" would be an enormous cost, probably contra to the Protection of the Conservation area and its heritage Assets. This all suggests a very easy way for the PC to prevent any further development in Church Road, as no one can afford to link to the pavement network, and such a requirement would deter from the historic environment of Church Road. This is not in the spirit of a development plan, but rather a restrictive plan. c) It is also interesting to note that within Stevington it is generally the development of estates in the last 60 years that started the trend of putting pavement into the village. Old photographs show no pavements. While there is a health and safety aspect of this, it is still a key element of the heritage aspect of the village, and blanketly requiring new pavements anywhere there may be development is not consistent with maintaining the heritage and look of the village, but instead urbanising it.	Review	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - the Policy wording has been edited to reflect the requirement to connect to existing footpaths where appropriate inline with BBC's recommendation and this comment	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	086	MK43 7QU	Policy T12	d) The Excel review mentions a lack of evidence in many points, so here are the findings of a survey carried out on 25.01.202, on the ground and via maps, of the pavement network in Stevington, which does not appear to be in the plan. Please see attached plan at end of letter. (NB This has been handed to the Parish Council Clerk as it would not attach) The finding shows that:- Burridges Close, Farley Way and Fox Brook do have pavements. In Court Lane, of the 60 houses - 37% do not have pavements at their front. In Church Road, of the 34 houses - 100 % do not have pavement access to the centre of the village. 82% do not have pavements at their front. In Park Road of 24 houses – 51% do not have pavements at their front. In Silver Street, of the 61 houses - only 8% do not have pavements at their front Duck End has no Pavements West End of 22 houses – 73% do not have pavements at their front	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Thank you the additional information, please see comment #085 with respect to the revised Policy wording		Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	087	MK43 7QU	Policy T12	e) The current policy on Pavements is very restrictive. Maybe a solution could be to say if there is one across the road no more needs to be added, or to say join to a pavement if one exists within 5 metres of the property; and if such a pavement would not have any impact of the historic setting and any heritage assets in close proximity to the planned development. If this policy also applies to possible developments under H03 which are outside the SPA, then it should be changed, as it will be virtually impossible to join such sites to any pavement network on a cost basis alone. f) Please can guidance be provided within T12 interpretation as to whether the policy is second to other policies or an equal primary requirement. Which would take precedent in the following example? :- "If a development was proposed in a gap in Court Lane, and it followed all but the pavement policy in T12, and there is no pavement but a wall or a hedge along the road side of the proposed development which are protected and covered by either your requirements for a non-designated heritage asset, or protection of the natural environment, but the only way to put in a pavement would be to remove some or all of the wall or hedge." Which policy would prevail? Would that plan be rejected?	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Please see the response to comment #085, all Policies within a NDP have equal weight and would be used to consider planning applications. It isn' really possible to comment on hyperthetical situations but in previous cases involving hedges, for example, applicants have provided options for mitigating hedgerow loss within their application.		Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name	Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action	Comment?	Task Status
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	088	MK43 7QG	Whole document	My main objections are 1. The document still does not actually support development, and so does not comply with the NPPF basic requirements - the plan is a wasted opportunity to create a real vision for the development of the village, and the mechanism to realise it. 2. The consultation process was weak to the extent that the required process has not been complied with. 3. Aside from the missed opportunities, there are a number of areas where the document requires revision, especially policies which are slightly or significantly 'off key' and require deletion or revision – most do not represent any actual unique need of the local area and so are at best superfluous as the 2030 plan. In these cases approval of the SNDP policies will undermine the planning process, risking local bias, putting the power in the hands of a tiny unprofessional body so adding uncertainty and confusion, and risking significant costs resulting from planning appeals.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The final Plan will be reviewed by our NDP consultant who will confirm from their profession planning opinion whether the Plan confirms to NPPF and meets the basic conditions, this will include statements on how the Plan meets Regulations 14 and 16, our LPA will then review the document and only pass it to Regulation 16 Independent Inspection if it agrees that it can implement the Plan and that it is not contrary to the Local Plan and Strategic Policy		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	089	MK43 7QG	Whole document	3.1 The local plan has been adopted and this plan requires revision Bedford Borough adopted the 2030 Local Plan on 20 January 2020. The Stevington Neighbourhood plan needs to be updated in the light of this change, including a check to ensure that the plan complies with the strategic policies in the 2030 plan, as required by the NPPT.	Edit - LP2030 update	Document Edit - reviewed and updated all references to emerging LP 2030 to reflect adopted status	Document Edit - updated with LP and AD references from LP 2030	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	090	MK43 7QG	Whole document	3.2 Typos inconsistencies and factual errors The SNDP contains many typos, inconsistencies and factual errors. Some of these have already been pointed out and not actions so I a not going to repeat them. We recommend that it is reviewed by a competent proof reader, or risk undermining the credibility of the plan.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The revised final version of the Plan will subject to a further proof reading exercise prior to its submission for Regulation 16		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	091	MK43 7QG	Whole document	The document does not support development so is in break of the basic conditions Despite the plan stating in the introduction that the plan will shape development and growth, and sets out a vision for the future, the overwhelming thrust of the plan is anti development, and there are no visionary initiatives. The plan still fails to meet its primary basic condition, objective as set out in the NPPF, which is to help to achieve sustainable development. Of the 11 policies in the document only one, policy 10 BE1 includes any statement of support for development. No actually development sites have been identified. There is nothing in the plan which actively delivers the developments the villagers said they wanted such as smaller houses for older people, a community shop, a bus service.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The NDP is not permitted to apply more restrictive controls on development than local and national policy. The purpose of this NDP is primarily to support sustainable and appropriate development that is in line with the village needs and sensitive to its scale and heritage. The final Plan will be reviewed by our NDP consultant who will confirm from their profession planning opinion whether the Plan confirms to NPPF and meets the basic conditions of an NDP		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	092	MK43 7QG	Whole document	The consultation process was inadequate Page 36 of the plan states "In order to achieve this it is desirable that the Neighbourhood Development Plan encourages positive cooperation between residents, landowners and developers in order to ensure a continuing interest in the future of the Village. This is the approach adopted in the Plan and based on this the Parish Council will look to engage positively with developers and the statutory planning authority to help guide future development in the village." Page 78 states "The plan was also shared widely with local parishes, local businesses and groups, Bedford Borough Council, Historic England, Natural England, Environment Agency and local landowners." This is factually incorrect. We own 36 acres at the edge of Stevington. No attempt whatsoever has been made to specifically engage with us. This same point applies to most local landowners, some of whom attended the Parish Council meeting at the end of the last consultation meeting, and is a matter of fact. We asked a number of questions, and asked for a formal response which was never given. We asked specifically for direct engagement, both in our responses to the plan, emails to the Parish Council and at the meeting. We asked to be part of the working group. The Parish Council did not even have the courtesy to reply, let alone to invite us to engage with them. We are utterly at a loss as to who the SNDP committee even is – no minutes have been published since 2017. The committee is referred to in the plan, if so why are there no minutes, is there even a committee? This is far too important a document to be not subject to due process and consultation and genuine community engagement.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The Consultation Statement section of the NDP details all of the activities and engagement opportunities that have been organised in order to maximise engagement with the whole of the Parish, both its residents and businesses. There has been widespread publicity for the engagement events and consultation phases, it would have been logistically impossible for us to discuss the Plan on a 1-2-1 basis with every resident and business owner in the Parish. The correspondent has received the same opportunity as every other interested party in helping to formulate the Plan, detailed feedback was only received at the consultation phase, which has and will be reviewed and will be assessed for inclusion in the final plan, along with all other relevant comments. All information regarding the workings of the SNDP working group are on the website, along with all responses to previous comments made, including this correspondent's submissions and questions raised (repeated) at the PC meeting referenced.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	093	MK43 7QG		There are a number of policy revisions which should be made. A list of policies if given below - this should be included in the plan as it is very hard to find the policies in all the wordy stuff in the plan.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The Policies are detailed only within the Section titled 'Policies' which seemed the most appropriate place for them. Each section includes an interpretation to aid planners with Policy wording interpretation, a single Policy list would diminish this valuable aid.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	094	MK43 7QG	HO1	The policy does not reference anything specific to Stevington or unique so it is not clear why Stevington needs its own policy to supersede the detailed well drafted policies in the 2030 Local Plan. In fact housing need has been identified by the report commissioned by the Parish Council itself, but the plan does not include any mechanism to deliver this need.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	All Policies have been reviewed by our consultant and the LPA, neither have highlighted any concerns with HO1. The housing numbers are aspirational and were not identified as a 'housing need' in any report commissioned by the Parish Council. There maybe confusion here with the Capacity Report that looked to confirm if the ambition of delivery around that number was feasible.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	095	MK43 7QG	HO2	It is welcome that the plan now includes a policy which addresses the local need. This was identified in the community consultation. I myself have direct experience of the needs of elderly people. It is not that hard to find smaller properties in Stevington, but it is very very hard to find properties suitable for elderly and disabled people. However, we applied under permitted development to converted a barn for my parents after my Dad had a stroke and was severely disabled. Despite the Parish Council stating here that new housing must be suitable for the disabled, it has to be noted that the Parish Council went out of their way to try to prevent us from converting our barn for my parents, including describing us a not 'the right sort of people' to get permission. Another person in the village was however supported in their planning application for their relations, where this was neither for smaller not elderly people. It is very hard to escape the conclusion that this village is subject to bias and favouritism. This is the very problem with putting planning policy in the hands of a small number of unprofessional people. Full details of the bias and challenges we have had with this Parish Council are available on request including copies of the full planning files and correspondence.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	<i>This comment isn't related to the NDP but an answer is provided here for completeness:</i> All of the current Parish Councillors are elected persons who have signed up to and are bound by Bedford Borough Council's code of conduct for Councillors, if you feel an individual or council as a whole has fallen short of these standards then please submit a complaint in writing to either the PC or BBC who will investigate and revert to you. The Parish Council do NOT have any planning powers they are an advisory body only for the LPA who will consider the PC's view along with any other respondent and make their decision based on current planning law.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	096	MK43 7QG	HO3	The conversion of existing, redundant agricultural and commercial buildings to new dwellings will be supported subject to: The phrase "suitable services and transport infrastructure" is unclear. I would also ask again why have no sites for smaller housing or housing suitable for the elderly been identified and promoted in the plan? This feels like a missed opportunity.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	We would expect suitable 'services and transport infrastructure' to be basic connectivity to all services i.e. avoid remote solutions, and adequate roadways that include pathways where possible. The Plan is not looking to identify individual sites as we believe there is already capacity to deliver new housing in the Parish. It also wouldn't be appropriate to limit development to a single type of housing as this could be considered unsustainable for a developer and potentially conflict with NPPF 2019.		Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name		Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	097	MK43 7QG	HO4	I have no idea why this policy is here. It is muddled, unclear and not supported by an evidence base. It refers to "subdivision of existing building to new dwellings". This is grammatically unclear. What is this concept in planning terms? Does it mean change of use to new dwelling? Where does the subdivision into new dwellings come in, in planning terms? What does 'of sufficient size mean? NB policy H02 seeks to add more smaller properties, how does this relate to H04? What does it mean by "suitable services and transport infrastructure" and why does this apply only to subdivision of existing buildings in the village. There is no justification in the plan of why Stevington needs this policy – why are we different from, everywhere else in the Borough, and what will not be covered by the local plan? Where is there any evidence to support the need for such a policy? The policy refers to a change of use The interpretation comments seems to introduce additional policies which are not stated in the actual policy "Sites that disproportionately reduce the garden amenity compared to existing dwellings of a similar size in the village will not be permitted" "Schemes which would result in harm will not usually be supported." My gut feel is that the Parish Council have in mind a particular site about which they are concerned and about which they which it restrict development. If this is the case, and there is local justification for restrictions additional to the adopted Borough Plan, this local plan should be transparent about these sites, and name them in the document so that the villagers can make an informed comment.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	"subdivision of existing building to new dwellings" is usually where a single dwelling is divided into two or more properties usually creating new but sometimes smaller units. The Interpretation section provides guidance on how this Policy is expected to be implemented, the LPA have not challenged HO4 so we assume they are comfortable with its conditions. The Parish Council has no concerns around any site that is currently under the Planning Application process beyond those views already expressed to the LPA, all new applications will be viewed on their merit in line with the stated Parish Council Policy SPC08		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	098	MK43 7QG	DH1	I'm really not sure why this policy is here and I am sorry to point out that it is very poorly drafted. There is adequate well drafted provision in the local plan – this policy should simply be removed. No explanation is made to what is distinctive about Stevington, i.e. the local vernacular. For example the policy refers to the degree of set back. There is no distinctiveness about Stevington of the degree of set back. All sorts of degrees of setback ca be found on every road in the village. Safe and convenient environments for pedestrians is not a distinctive feature of the village – most of the village has no footpaths. What are attractive frontages? Who decides? What is high quality planting? What does 'access for people of all abilities' mean – gymnastics, ballet dancers, quadriplegics blind or deaf people? What is this policy trying to achieve? I am sorry to poor cold water on a well meaning policy, but this is a legal planning document. It needs to be held to high standard of account.	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	All Policies have been written and reviewed in conjunction with out NDP consultant, the LPA have also reviewed the Policy and have not raised any issues with the wording or interpretation. The Policy requires consideration be given to the characteristics of the site and surrounding context, the key aspects are included in the Policy wording. The policy seeks to promote sustainability by addressing public safety, character, amenity, landscape protection, pedestrian convenience and local character, which we believe it does. The comment re access for all people is addressed under comment #042 above		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	099	MK43 7QG	DH2	This policy should be deleted for the following reasons: • The Bedford Borough 2030 adopted plan Policy 41S - Historic environment and heritage assets is a well drafted policy related to heritage assets which already covers this policy area • Neighbourhood plans cannot redefine policy, in the absence of any local significant and detail this policy is not needed and undermines and confuses planning policy • This SNP policy is unclear and ambiguous, as it does not define key terms such as harm, and dominate, no evidence base is required by the policy • This policy is potentially a device to unreasonably restrict development in the village, contrary to the objectives of the NPPF	None	Statement & Question Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	All Policies have been written and reviewed in conjunction with out NDP consultant, the LPA have also reviewed the Policy and have not raised any issues with the wording or interpretation.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	100	MK43 7QG	DH3	This is the only policy in the plan which relates to the windmill. The windmill is in fact an extremely valuable asset to the local area and is a unique feature of Stevington. This is the elephant in the room re the plan. Where are the policies in the plan which are supportive of the windmill, which will fund its ongoing maintenance in these cash strapped times? The actual policy here is frankly crackers, which I stated in the previous consultation. I have no idea why the Parish Council are hanging onto a silly policy which is based on factual errors, an inappropriate Dutch model for a wind corridor for a wind turbine which is no longer even reference in the plan. dThis policy should be withdrawn for the following reasons. The mill is not an actual working windmill. The map OS map on page 46 (nb the diagram has no reference) itself describes the mill as disused. The mill has not had sails on it for several months, and for at least 16 of the 22 years we have overlooked the mill, the mill has had no sails on it, by which I mean wooden sails. In the short period of time that the mill has had wooden sails it has had canvas coverings a couple of times a year and the sails have need turned by hand not by the wind. And it has not ground anything. It is a post mill that no longer turns on the post. It has not ground corn since the second world war. It is not the "last remaining example of a working windmill in the County" as described in the SNDP - Beds Borough Council itself describe it in the past tense: "Stevington Windmill is an impressive postmill built in the 18th century and is the only complete windmill left in Bedfordshire. It was constructed around a central post so that it can be turned to face into the wind. The windmill operated commercially, mostly grinding cattle feed, until 1939. It was purchased and restored in 1951 by Bedfordshire County Council, as part of the County's contribution to the Festival of Britain. Stevington Windmill was probably the last windmill in Britain working with four common (cloth covered) sails, which were replaced 2004. The sails are turned periodically and the machinery, though requiring constant maintenance, is in rough working order." The methodology referred to is not appropriate for an old windmill – it is for power generating wind turbines. In any case the red circle is does not correspond to the actual wind tunnel shown in blue. Is this policy is merely an artificial device aimed at preventing development opportunities near to existing buildings in the village which would otherwise be hard to resist on otherwise legitimate planning grounds? There statutory controls related to development near a grade 2 listed building are well tested and understood, and are sufficient in themselves to control development in the immediate vicinity of the mill	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The NDP relates only to matters of Planning, it can not set Policy around funding for the windmill. However, for information, the Parish Council is already in discussions with Bedford Borough Council as to the future of the mill after the final restorations are completed and how the annual maintenance will be conducted and funded. The restoration work completed in 2018 was in preparation for the cloth sails to be set during the spring/summer of 2019, however as part of that preparation work a problem was discovered with the current sail stocks which need to be replaced. BBC and SPC are working together to have these repairs completed, currently scheduled for first week of May 2020, so the mill is far from being disused, in fact a working demonstration is scheduled for later this year. The <i>Danish</i> wind model is the source of the information to determine possible disturbance range impact, this is relevant to any structure that uses wind as a source of energy. The requirement is that a developer prove that an new application has no impact on the wind corridor of a valuable heritage asset, it doesn't prevent development.		Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name		Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	101	MK43 7QG	EN2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I have no objection to sites A to C which I believe meet the NPPF definition of local green space.</li><li>• Site D however does not meet the criteria and the content of the plan in relation to this is factually incorrect.</li><li>• The SNDP has been revised to correct some factual inaccuracies in the first draft, including describing the belt as an ancient wood. However several inaccuracies remain, which serve merely to undermine the credibility of the plan.</li><li>• The site as drawn excludes the footpath – it is the other dies of the drain / ditch shown on the map. There is no public access through the Stevington Belt. There is private access for the local fishing club only. This land does not meet the criteria for a local green space.</li><li>• As explained with evidential support in our previous consultation response the Ouse Valley Way and the John Bunyan trail do not run up this footpath next to the Belt, they both go from Bromham to Stevington, not Oakley to Stevington.</li><li>• The park is an open agricultural field. No idea of why the document refers to the Lords of the Manor, the Park was actually owned by the Duke of Bedford, who never owned the Manor House. This is all well documented in the excellent book produced by the Stevington Historical Society. I am sure the owner of the land has explained the facts to the Parish Council as well. There is relatively recent evidence of development in the belt (a derelict brick built building and a landing stage). This information and photos was all detailed in our previous response and it is disappointing that the Parish Council have still got this wrong – we own the field bordering the belt – why did they not speak to us? Or the land owner?</li><li>• In the 21 years we have lived virtually opposite the belt, and the 6 years we have owned and daily walked the field next to the belt, we have not seen any hobbies in the belt. Hobbies are not rare, their conservation status is green. We used to have kestrels nesting in our Oak trees, not for a few years, maybe the local bird watcher mistook a kestrel for a hobby.</li><li>• These basic factual errors characterised the previous versions of plan, which was full of nonsense, and the inclusion of these errors still begs the question, do the Parish Council actually know the local area? Its all a bit pointless anyway – no one will want to develop the belt.</li></ul>	Review	Review Site D narrative	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Please see comment #072 with regard to the history of the 'belt' from the current owner who provides an excellent summary and was actively included in the Consultation phase (please note there is no requirement to consult neighbours of LGS sites beyond the geberic publicity that you will have seen and recieved already). Inclusion of Site D was included as it was felt it met the necessary criteria as LGS. Please see the original response to your comments re the OVW and Bunyan trail from the first consultation phase.	Check wording for Site D? Does the JB trail and OVW pass down here?	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	102	MK43 7QG	EN2	Following the policy interpretation for EN2 there follows some paragraphs which are not policy, and are summarised in what is described as a 'vision statement'. It is very unclear what the purpose of these paragraphs is, and what their status is in planning terms. There is a slightly odd reference to "significant landscape views which need protecting from development in order to ensure there is no adverse impact on this landscape and the setting of the village is preserved" which are not in any policy in the plan, and an unreferenced diagram with green and red arrows, which covers pretty much all the fields around the village, is not supported by any evidence, and some of the arrows only cross private land with views which only the landowners themselves can see! This section seems to be another device to restrict development – the Parish Council having accepted that their previous attempt to use Local Green Spaces to achieve restriction on development (as evidenced in PC minutes, per our previous consultation response). This section is muddled, and should be withdrawn.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	All Policies have been written and reviewed in conjunction with out NDP consultant, the LPA have also reviewed the Policy and have not raised any issues with the wording or interpretation.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	103	MK43 7QG	TI2	This policy requires new developments to connect to the existing pavement network. Most houses on the 4 cross roads in Stevington are not on a footpath – this is actually a feature of Stevington. It is not possible to connect to the existing footpaths if a plot is not already at the edge of a footpath as the ground on which a path could go is either owned by highways or another private land owner. So either the policy is not deliverable, and so is wrong headed, or it is deliberately another device to stop development. In either case it should be withdrawn.	Review	Minor - Edit	Document Edit - the Policy wording has been edited to reflect the requirement to connect to existing footpaths where appropriate inline with BBC's recommendation and this comment	Revision completed - v5 February 2020		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	104	MK43 7QG	TI2	The provision of a cycle store is not anything unique to Stevington and is adequately covered in the 2030 plan. All of my family cycle. My boys had/have to cycle 15 miles a day to Bedford as the bus could not get them to sixth form collage in Bedford unless they left 2 hrs early. Provision of a cycle store is a stupid policy – bikes can be stored in the tiniest of flats hung on the wall. What about a meaningful policy to stop stupid drivers running them off the road on the blind bends around the village, (some of these drivers are villagers), or decent busses that would get non drivers like them or my elderly mum, who of course does not ride a bike into town . Another missed opportunity for a meaningful policy.	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	All Policies have been written and reviewed in conjunction with out NDP consultant, the LPA have also reviewed the Policy and have not raised any issues with the wording or interpretation. Encouraging residents to take regular exercise is in line with Local and Government Policy. Highways and Bus Service provisions are matters that BBC should be able to help you with.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	105	MK43 7QG	BE2	I strongly support the provision of good internet connectivity. Failure to address this nationally is I believe a significant factor in the country's poor productivity record. In Stevington Broadband is poor. This is a genuinely unique feature of the village which the local plan could address. It is barrier to economic growth and well being of the villagers. I would strongly support a policy which actively addressed the under par connectivity of the village. For example the plan could support developments which provide broadband infrastructure, such as a community owned network. <a href="https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/09/build-your-own-broadband-brings-rural-british-communities-together/">https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/09/build-your-own-broadband-brings-rural-british-communities-together/</a> This policy, however, is inadequate. It will not however deliver better infrastructure. It is not deliverable, and is a distraction and again I believe a wrong headed policy. As stated in the previous consultation this statement should be withdrawn for the following reasons: It is not possible for a developer to deliver high speed internet or to achieve no negative impact on existing telecoms or infrastructure. Existing infrastructure and available internet capability is the responsibility of the internet service providers. Their service is determined by Ofcom and there is no mechanism available of a developer to influence this . The policy is not deliverable. It is not possible to evidence sufficiency of even existing Broadband speeds. The policy could be replaced with the 2030 policy 94 which is deliverable and achieves a higher standard of broadband performance, however this is unnecessary as the Local Plan already delivers the policy	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Fibre optic broadband is already available within the village to the majority of homes, Policy BE2 looks to ensure that all new dwellings consider access to broadband as a mandatory requirement. As with all Policies in the NDP these have been reviewed by professional planning consultants and the LPA who have not raised issues with the aims or wording.		Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #13	106	MK43 7QG	CF1	Bedford Borough 2030 ha 21 references to community facilities, and the SNDP has a policy re community facilities. It is very disappointing and unhelpful that neither document define community facilities. Milton Keynes Plan 14.1 does in fact provide a definition as follows 14.1 "Community facilities" covers the wide range of facilities and services required by any community. It includes education, health and community care, meeting halls, libraries, places of worship, burial grounds and emergency services." We are very pleased that the Red Lion Pub as well as the Royal George pub is now recognised. It is a pub. It is used by the community. However further to our previous response to the plan the former Methodist Chapel is not a community asset. We presume that NDHA stands for non designated heritage asset, but an old building is not a community asset – a non designated heritage asset is not the same as a community facility. This building has not served any community purpose for years. It has not served any of the community definitions in the MK plan list. It is a private building. The fact that it employed local people is neither here nor there – are buildings where local businesses which employ people to be designated a community assets? Clearly not. This building should please now be removed from the list of community facilities. This sort of misunderstanding of planning terms and policy is very worrying. Why have the Parish Council been so determined to prevent development of this building, which in in the SPA? The building is empty, has been empty now for a few years, what at the Parish Council trying to achieve?	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The inclusion of the Chapel as a Community Facility was based on feedback from the village and evidenced within the questionnaire, it should be noted, however, that Policy CF1 allows for redevelopment where it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer required. It should be noted that the Parish Council have no decision making powers for any planning application, the PC is an advisory body only and relates the majority opinion of the council to the LPA for consideration. The Chapel has been subject to a recent planning application appeal where the inspector confirmed the Non Designated Heritage Asset status of the building under (BBC planning application reference) APP/K0235/W/18/3218957 on 17th July 2019.		Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received December 2019 to January 2020										
Name		Postcode	Document Section	Comment	Action	Type	Rational/Response	Action / Reasoning	Action Comment?	Task Status
Natural England	107	CW1 6GJ	Whole document	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	Noted - thank you.		Completed
Correspondents #14	108	MK43 7QT	Whole document	Any future development should be on brown-field sites only. Infrastructure cannot support more housing and integrity of our historic village must be protected. Our lanes are too narrow to accommodate extra traffic	None	Statement Only	No Further Action Required - Please see comments for explanation	The support for development of brownfield sites within the SPA is recognised on Page 10 of the NDP, the remaining comments are broadly in line with the evidence gathered to date		Completed



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #1	1	N/A	p42, Policy DH03 change to 'it is proven not to impede'	Edit	Review section, edit made (also noted under comment #38)	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Stevington PCC	2	N/A	Thank you to SPC and SNDPWG for the work that has gone into making the Plan for the benefit of Stevington residents now and in coming years	None	Noted with thanks	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	NA	Completed
Stevington PCC	3	N/A	We appreciate that the Plan seeks to both preserve the historic and natural environment while allowing sustainable development over the lifetime of the Plan	None	Noted with thanks	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	NA	Completed
Stevington PCC	4	N/A	Rationale at beginning of Design & Heritage section does not sufficiently recognise the significance of the Grade 1 listed parish Church and its environs	Edit	Review section, edit made to Policy HO1 to require development to preserve or enhance the CA and settings of heritage assets (including the church)	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Stevington PCC	5	N/A	The Holy Well is of international significance being a site of pilgrimage, the only physical site in Bedfordshire (see Britain's holiest places, Nick Mayhew-Smith)	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Stevington PCC	6	N/A	The Church has significant architectural features, e.g. Anglo Saxon tower and medieval pew ends which are not mentioned	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Stevington PCC	7	N/A	PCC would like to see Church Road, the area of the Church and Holy Well more specifically protected as a vital part of Stevington life, site of pilgrimage and SSSI	Edit	Review section, update Policy HO1 to require development to preserve or enhance the CA and settings of heritage assets (including the church). LGS designations look to strengthen the siting of the church itself	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Stevington PCC	8	N/A	PCC considers mention of 'Friends of Stevington Windmill' and omission of 'Friends of St Mary's' to be an error	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondents #8	9	MK43 7QB	Site AA The Manor Farmhouse. Site A space is not in front but beside the Manor Farmhouse, now a garden enclosed by a hedge for last 25 years.	None	Please see response comment #10	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondents #8	10	MK43 7QB	Site AA The Manor Farmhouse. Private garden is not adjacent to Church Road; it is a private space in a Conservation Area, no reason to have other designation.	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondents #8	11	MK43 7QB	No consultation on this matter and emails have been ignored.	None	The Working Group are not aware of any emails from the respondent on this matter sent to them but will ensure they are engaged as part of the second Regulation 14 consultation	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Correspondents #8	12	MK43 7QB	Site is not bordering old wood and Bluebell Wood - it is 1/4 mile away	None	Please see response comment #10	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	13	MK43 7QS	Has sufficient weight been given to S106 funding opportunities	None	Carry forward to second consultation phase	None - after review it was agreed that S106 requests can be managed outside of the NDP process by the PC	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	14	MK43 7QS	Are there places where wording might give Stevington better access to local funding opportunities as the village will be affected by development in adjacent villages	None	Please see response comment #13	None - Please see response comment #13	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	15	MK43 7QB	PC has produced precise, detailed document and all involved should be thanked	None	Noted with thanks	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	NA	Completed
Correspondent #4	16	MK43 7QB	More 'breathing space' in pages would help lay reader	Edit	Edit required of final version formatting	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	17	MK43 7QB	Numbering of sections and sub-sections would help navigation of text	Edit	Edit required of final version formatting	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	18	MK43 7QB	Special designations' is clearer heading then 'Listed Buildings'	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	19	MK43 7QB	Suggest a list of special designation buildings should be included as the existence of so many contributes to the fabric of the village	None	No further action at this time given the time constraints in getting the Plan completed taken against the time required to agree the criteria and produce the list	None - please see response comment #19	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	20	MK43 7QB	Is West End considered part of the Plan or simply a hamlet with its own feeling of identity?	None	West End is considered in so far as all Policies within the Plan apply Parish wide, however, the Plan does not seek to change the current protections West End receives by being outside of the current SPA boundary (see comment #023)	None - please see response comment #20	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	21	MK43 7QB	Proposed LGS T and Z are clearly put forward to counter ribbon development and to protect village and West End from major expansion	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	22	MK43 7QB	LGSs V,W,X and Y contain the developed area of West End from major expansion without actually saying so	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	23	MK43 7QB	There are gaps in West End whose development not visually harmful. As outside SPA, would not be included in target of 11-15 new dwellings through to 2035	None	The question of WE being outside the SPA was not identified as a primary consideration during the engagement events and therefore was not evidenced as part of the plan process	None - please see response comment #23 & #24	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	24	MK43 7QB	PC should clarify status of West End - protected by SPA boundary or left to fend off future applications as not part of village	None	As West End is situated outside of the development SPA it would, theoretically, be provided with more protection as development in rural areas outside of a SPA is generally resisted.	None - please see response comment #23 & #24	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	25	MK43 7QB	p 55 & 68. LGSs G through to CC already 'have protection due to listing as SSSI or through other legislation. If so, why are they 'proposed'?	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	26	MK43 7QB	p 51. Were the owners of all the 'proposed' spaces consulted as to their future status and limitations placed on them as regards future development?	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups, notification advice has been taken and will form part of the second pre-submission Reg 14 consultation phase	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	27	MK43 7QB	The 'proposed LGSs have village support shown as %age. This is confusing - exclude %age support for clarity	None	The percentage support is part of the evidence base to confirm if the residents agreed with the potential designation of a site as LGS	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #4	28	MK43 7QB	Presumable site D cannot now be considered an Open Space?	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	29	MK43 7QB	Site G Lake Meadow. The Well Dressing is displayed in the Church porch; impractical to set it by the Holy Well	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #4	30	MK43 7QB	Site F Red Lion Pub Garden: text on p57 duplicates that on p68	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #4	31	MK43 7QB	Fully support the introduction of LGSs subject to other comments	None	Comment noted	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #5	32	Burrige's Cl	p77 Sustainable Urban Drainage. Stevington should be looking for developer to provide betterment over existing site conditions	None	Consider review/update of SUD section	No further action - Betterment is a term used for taxing part of the uplift in value of a site	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #5	33	Burrige's Cl	p77 Should be mention of improvements to water quality as well as reducing both rate and volume of surface water drainage	Edit	Update made to wording of Policy v3.01 for surface drainage, water quality does not fall within the scope of the NDP	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #5	34	Burrige's Cl	p76 Road Impact Assessment. Modern day standard is 5.5m wide road or 6.1m for bus routes	Edit	Removed stated 7.4m width, range is generally accepted as 5.5m to 7.3m for single carriage ways but there is no legal minimum	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #5	35	Burrige's Cl	p55 Site I second bullet point does not relate to this field as no walk through field; actually runs through the bottom of adjacent gardens	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #5	36	Burrige's Cl	p55 Site I there is an abundance of bats, birds and other mammals that use this field as part of their habitat	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #5	37	Burrige's Cl	p55 Site I sits close to conservation area; access to field is through conservation area which would not support additional traffic	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #5	38	Burrige's Cl	p42 Policy DH03 word missing from green text box	Edit	Edit required (repeats comment #01)	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #5	39	Burrige's Cl	p35 Interpretation. First para refers to 'buildings within existing built environment'. This is vague; should be expanded to be clear what is included or otherwise.	None	Policy HO1 enables new development within the village, but all development is contained with the village SPA which is referenced prior to the Policy wording under the Housing and Growth section	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondents #6	40	West End	LGS Y. Part of site not included. The area was subject to unauthorised development in the past but was restored to original state following BBC enforcement notice	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #2	41	Cranfield	Objection to the whole of site Z (Lancroft Furlong) being considered open space: upper open space between West End and new farm entrance affords view	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #2	42	Cranfield	Lower area below bottle bank would be ideal spot for development; would be interested to discuss with PC	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #12	43	West End	Has had considerable difficulty accessing associated documentation for the NP; specific documents listed below	None	Response made directly to respondent on item requested	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	44	West End	Urban Vision report on space for building in SPA	None	Appended to the NDP website	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	45	West End	Responses to Village questionnaire	None	Appended to the NDP website	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	46	West End	Response from BBC to pre-submission review made on proposed NP	None	Confirmed as response to Local Plan 2032/5 at that time, not a specific BBC response to the NDP which is a separate planning document	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	47	West End	Stevington Parish Council Local Green Space submission (2016)	None	Appended to the NDP website	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	48	West End	Many links on stevington.com unavailable and website is not a secure site	None	Resolved under scheduled periodic NDP website review, security is irrelevant as all data stored is in the public domain or intentionally made available for review and comment to all	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	49	West End	Minutes of SNPWG available only up to 5 June 2017	None	Appended August 2017 minutes to the NDP website	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12	50	West End	Requests extension of consultation period	None	PC agreed to the request (new end date 10th July 2019)	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	51	Park Road	Requests extension to consultation period	None	PC agreed to the request (new end date 10th July 2019)	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	52	Park Road	Links on NP website broken for much of consultation period	None	Resolved under periodic NDP website review, note added to confirm nature of external links changing and being outside the control of the NPWG	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	53	Park Road	References in Plan are not included on website as documents or hyperlinks	None	Appended to the NDP website	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	54	Park Road	BBC response to proposed designated LGS (March 2015) not available	None	Please see comment #46	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	55	Park Road	Responses to village questionnaire are available but not wording of questionnaire	None	Appended to the NDP website	None - unrelated to Plan document (request completed during consultation phase)	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	56	Park Road	Proposed policy BE01 is unreasonable restrictive in seeking to restrict development to existing buildings and businesses and inconsistent with Local policy & NPPF	Edit	Although an opinion statement policy wording has been revised to clarify purpose for new business related development	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	57	Park Road	Would like PC to include consideration of several possible developments (see VB email 11June - listed below)	None	Development options for the NDP were based on extensive feedback and interaction with residents, land owners and businesses from 2015 to 2018	None - proposal is contrary to the aims and scope of the NDP	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	58	Park Road	Proposed Policy HO1 is not deliverable contrary to requirement of legislation relating to NPs.	None	Opinion statement only - Note: all proposed Polices have been reviewed with our NDP consultant and by BBC as part of the pre-consultation and consultation phases	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	59	Park Road	No sites in SPA put forward in BBC call for sites; PC did not have a call for sites	None	The independent capacity report provided confirmation that the development target could be reasonably be expected to be accommodated within the SPA/farm building conversion sites. A call for sites was not felt appropriate given the modest levels of development supported by the residents	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed

**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11	60	Park Road	Housing outside SPA likely to be needed to meet recognised housing need	None	This is clarified with the Capacity Report, please see response to comment #59	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	61	Park Road	Questionnaire response: 51.2% agrees new dwellings outside SPA may be considered if justified on sustainability grounds	None	Please see response comment #59	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	62	Park Road	Questionnaire response: 56.7% agreed new dwellings outside SPA my be considered providing they provide community facility or recreation route	None	Please see response comment #59	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	63	Park Road	NPPF para 14 states overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development if housing need identified	None	Opinion statement only	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	NA	Completed
Correspondent #11	64	Park Road	Requests SNP is revised to include consideration of specific sites outside SPA evaluated against stated local housing need - specifically Barrett owned land	None	Please see response comment #59 Should a future call for sites be required then it would be made open to all landowners, therefore consideration of individually proposed sites would be inappropriate at this stage of the NDP process	None - contrary to the aims and scope of the NDP agreed with residents	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #11	65	Park Road	SNP should include reinstating sites of former housing in the village, e.g. in the 'Ends'	None	Please see response comment #59 Ends are currently outside of the usual development SPA, reinstating current but derelict housing would already be considered under the current planning process	None - option already exists under the current planning process	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #11	66	Park Road	SNP designations do not comply with the strict criteria for LGS given in NPPF	None	Opinion statement only - Note: the LGS submission has been reviewed and updated based on feedback received from UVE and other NDP groups	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	67	Park Road	No methodology for identifying them has been used in NPPF - not defined in NP; BBC; other Borough; or any other body or publication	None	Opinion statement only - Note: the LGS submission has been reviewed and updated based on feedback received from UVE and other NDP groups, remaining LGS sites have been reviewed and evidenced in accordance with the NPPF guidelines	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	68	Park Road	All but one site has already been assessed and rejected by BBC so NP out of step with Local Plan	None	Opinion statement only - Note: the LGS submission has been reviewed and updated based on feedback received from UVE and other NDP groups, remaining LGS sites have been reviewed and evidenced in accordance with the NPPF guidelines and will be checked for conformity to the LP by BBC	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	69	Park Road	Sites not supported by any robust evidence base in NP	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	70	Park Road	Reasons given in NP for designations include numerous factual errors and overstatements/exaggerations	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	71	Park Road	Purpose seems to be to prevent any land around the village being developed	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	72	Park Road	Sites are inconsistent and arbitrary implying underlying bias and lack of partiality in site selection	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	73	Park Road	NPPF criteria are subject to interpretation and there is no nationally accepted interpretation. NP requires that they are in line with Local Plans/planning policy	None	Opinion statement only	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	74	Park Road	NP paras refer to old not current NPPF guidelines	Edit	Review NPPF references for completeness	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #11	75	Park Road	PC submitted proposed LGS to BBC (2015); only site E recommended; all other sites assessed as not meeting criteria i.e. NP not in line with local policy	None	Please see response comment #68	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	76	Park Road	Evidence base for designations in NP is weak, inconsistent and in many cases factually incorrect	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	77	Park Road	Resident survey questionnaire is not included in NP as appendix	None	The recommendation for NDP format is to include evidence within a supporting pack rather than including it within the main document body, the questionnaire results will form part of this pack once submitted for inspection along with other evidences and documents	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	78	Park Road	It is implausible that the 23 proposed sites and so much land is 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold particular local significance'	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	79	Park Road	If all proposed designations retained in NP, need to look at land ownership and planning history of sites for evidence of bias/favouritism in PC documentation	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or evidence provided, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	80	Park Road	Is favouritism behind excluding land next to designated land for which almost identical arguments apply?	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or evidence provided, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	81	Park Road	NP does not propose a single specific site for development	None	Please see response comment #59	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11	82	Park Road	Land around Old Mill House and between CC L and between CC and road not proposed for designation	None	Please see response comment #67	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	83	Park Road	Land on opposite side of road around Mill Farm next to windmill not designated, though closer to village and windmill. Argument apply more to this site than site M	None	Please see response comment #67	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	84	Park Road	Similar point with regard to inclusion of Royal George and exclusion of Red Lion as community asset.	Edit	At the time of the evidencing the Red Lion site was derelict and opinion in the village was split as to its inclusion in the community asset list, subsequent advice from BBC is to include it given its revised operating status, adding as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	85	Park Road	Likely CC, L, M and O do not satisfy criteria for inclusion as LGS	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	86	Park Road	Stevington Country Walk is not on PC website/ publications undermining any claim of being particular value to community. Not protected by legislation or designation	None	Opinion statement - however SCW is referenced with in the NDP document as it is an important recreational facility, it also has locally strategic important views to the village, windmill and the Great Ouse Valley	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	87	Park Road	No evidence to support Stevington Belt as ancient (as defined by Natural England) rich in biodiversity. Evidence available contradicts this claim	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment as no evidence shared	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	88	Park Road	No evidence of value for biodiversity; indeed use of adjacent track by vehicles and dog walkers would compromise wildlife	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	89	Park Road	Ouse Valley Way is not historic not of particular value to Stevington - created by Countryside Agency after 1999. Not publicised locally or marked on noticeboards	None	Given the universally accepted health benefits associated with access to green space for recreational and mental health wellbeing the Ouse Valley Way is referenced as it provides such facility, encouraging a healthier lifestyle	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	90	Park Road	John Bunyan Way has no historical significance: created by Bedfordshire Ramblers for their Diamond Jubilee in 1995	None	Given the universally accepted health benefits associated with access to green space for recreational and mental health wellbeing the John Bunyan Way is referenced as it provides such facility, encouraging a healthier lifestyle	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	91	Park Road	None of the wildlife referred to is remarkable or rare or of particular importance to Stevington; evidence base is weak and unconvincing outside SSSIs	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	92	Park Road	In NP making, the qualifying body should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of land as LGS. (NPPF) also BBC	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	93	Park Road	Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals (NPPF)	None	SPC has previously met with developers, landowners and interested parties during the public engagement period from 2015 to 2018. Several parties took this opportunity, some making specific presentations to the PC. These have been considered as part of the Plan creation process. The current consultation period is the opportunity for everyone to make comment on the NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	94	Park Road	No attempt by PC to contact VB who owns two of the sites in either 2015 (LGS submission to BBC) or in preparation of NP	None	Please see comment #92	None - duplicate to comment #92	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	95	Park Road	No attempt to create a checklist to evaluate the proposed LGS in NP against NPPF	None	The rationale for including a site as LGS is fully documented with the NDP, the NPPF does not propose a specific checklist for site selection hence NDP does not look to create one	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	High	Completed
Correspondent #11	96	Park Road	Specific rebuttals on individual sites given - see email of 11 June for details	None	None required <statement relates to opinions noted above>	None - duplicate to comments already noted above	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	97		Document should have para numbers	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	98		Footnotes for references more useful at the bottom of each page.	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	99		More details of source documents would be useful	Task	Carry forward to second consultation phase	Carried Forward Task	Low	Carried Forward Task Questionnaire Data/Responses Road Survey Data Analysis i.e. build trends etc
Bedford Borough Council	100		If NP to be submitted before LP 2030 adopted, LP2030 policies not relevant; all refs in NP should be deleted	None	The basic condition relating to general conformity will be considered against the old adopted plan. So this needs to be referenced in this respect. However, it is also useful to refer to the emerging plan. The evidence base for the emerging plan may be part of the evidence base for the NP. Also, there is a risk of the new LP reversing some changes in the NP, if they are incompatible.	None - please see response comment #100	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	101		No need to repeat NPP in full as this may change; all refs to NPPF should be 2019	Edit	Review NPPF references for completeness	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed

**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name	Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Bedford Borough Council	102	In later chapters, Local Policy sections refer to NPPF and NPPG which are national policy; earlier chapters have national policy section	None	The references to NPPF in sections titled 'Local Policy' are only where the reference is contained within a quotation taken from Local Policy itself or where the NPPF statement relates to a Local Policy document such as the Local Plan, or the relevant local planning process	None - please see response comment #102	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	103	Check all refs - one section refers to Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2016, elsewhere it is 2018	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	104	Introduction refers to Bedford Borough and Milton Keynes - not considered relevant to Stevington Parish. Could put in separate document	None	Locality advice is to that it is good practice to set out the wider strategic context of the Parish	None - please see response comment #104	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	105	Government abolished regions and regional plans under Localism Act 2011; consider if reference to Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Region is relevant	Edit	Review section, edit made	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	106	p21 & 22; Bedford Landscape Character Assessment not relevant to NP; could reference in background document	None	Referenced only in helping set the context of the village and that the area has been recognised as having a high biodiverse value	None - please see response comment #106	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	107	Could join together sections, e.g. on built environment and built character	Task	Carry forward to second consultation phase	Carried Forward Task	Low	Carried Forward Task
Bedford Borough Council	108	p11 applicants of planning applications encouraged to meet with PC before submission; helpful in explaining PC's values for the area to developers	Edit	Review section, edit made - the PC is cognizant of not making the NDP too prescriptive or restrictive by outlining specific values as these may change over the time of the Plan	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	109	Assessing how developments meet requirements of NP policies should be done through pre-application process assisted by clear NP policies	None	Pre-application guidance can be requested from the PC (as well as BBC), each Policy has an interpretation section to help guide application assessments	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	110	NP strategy section could be expanded to include support for historic environment and its role in creating local distinctiveness	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	111	Policies Map p12 is Policies Map from 2014, not just Local Plan 2002 but Core Strategy & Rural Issues Plan 2008 and A&D Local Plan 2013	Edit	Updated Polices Map title	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	112	p20: correct designation for the Cross is 'Scheduled Monument' rather than 'Ancient Monument'	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	113	Use Roman numerals for listing grades, not numbers	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	114	Holy Well is listed Grade II and could be clarified	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	115	Medieval' misspelt in para 4 of section	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	116	Improve start of final para to 'The Almshouses fronting Park Road are Grade II listed and were constructed on 1639 by the trustees of the late William Barringer'	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	117	p22 para 2: the A&D Plan was adopted in 2013. The Green Spaces return related to LGSs, part of Local Plan 2030, not A&D Local Plan 2013	Edit	Reference updated to confirm 2013, removed reference of submission to better reflect the purpose of LGS designation within the NDP itself	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	118	p23: some of text could be included in consultation statement instead of including a lot of detail in NP	None	There is a statutory requirement for a consultation statement and a basic conditions statement to form part of the plan submission. The focus of the consultation statement will be on Reg 14. Most plans include a brief summary of what was done and the main issues that emerged to inform policy. The outcomes section in the plan should focus on key themes and issues arising from early engagement, which then informed policy themes. Reg 14 will be dealt with through the consultation statement.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	119	p27: Policies - no need to refer to a list of plans, documents and strategies. Particular documents supporting a policy can be quoted but no need to repeat	None	Consider editing the final document if time permits	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	120	Section on relevant plans can be included at start of policies section or in an appendix	None	Covered by comment #119	None - please see response comment #119	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	121	p32 NPPF ref updated to 2019. First para on Housing White Paper (2017) no longer makes sense	Edit	Update reference as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	122	p32 SPA boundaries most recently reviewed for 2013 A&D Local Plan	Edit	Update reference as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	122a	SPA boundary drawn following criteria detailed in ch13 of this, not European designation	None	The statement with respect to European designation is to confirm that no link exists to any European designation rather than to imply it does	None - please see response comment #122a	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	123	p34 Under SPA capacity review, how was target of 11-15 homes derived. Any housing needs assessment?	Edit	The target is asperational (now made clearer in the plan text) and was derived based on analysis of the previous 15 year development trend for new dwellings and businesses in the village combined with the highest supported and also median number (78.8% support) of new houses that the residents felt was appropriate for the village. The target would represent an approximate 5% increase in the total number of dwellings in the village over the plan period. As a Tier 3 village Stevington does not have a proposed housing target under the current or emerging Local Plans however it was felt that by opting to include a housing target within our NDP that we could help contribute to the overall Borough wide housing target whilst still delivering houses at a sustainable level for the village and which meets their expectations.	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name	Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task	
Bedford Borough Council	124		2nd last para: evidence to demonstrate that over NP duration, no need to identify specific sites for new housing. What is current rate of development?	None	Current rate of delivered housing is approximately an increase of 5.1% in total dwellings over the preceding 15 years, the aspirational target of 11-15 new dwellings represents a further increase in the range of 4.1% to 5.6% over the Plan period.	None - please see response comment #124	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	125		2nd last para: BBC development management team have suggested specific wording to strengthen limitations on size of any development (see BBC June 2019)	Edit	Review and consider implications of this statement, may need liaison with BBC to understand the referenced wording	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	126		p35, Policy HO1: what is meant by garden spaces and is there any minimum size? What is requirement for off-road parking	Edit	Updated document to clarify garden size within interpretation, off-road parking requirement confirmed	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	127		Parking Standards for Sustainable Communities SPD (adopted 2014) covering parking standards could be referenced	Edit	Consider updating reference as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	128		Policy HO1 should include bullet point 'Preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA and preserving the setting of heritage assets'	Edit	Updated references as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	129		Interpretation section should also factor these issues in	Edit	Updated references as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	130		Para 4: 'consideration will also be made towards the special interest of the Conservation Area and the impact of development on the significance of heritage assets, including listed buildings'	Edit	Updated references as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	131		Final para: worth clarifying that demolition within CA almost always requires planning permission	Edit	Updated references as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	132		p36: remove sentence: screening related to European sites are part of EIA regulations and this is part of the planning process	None	This statement was included on the recommendation of the HRA document author (as revised January 2019) - removing the reference could potential put us in breach of the HRA negative impact conclusion (pass)	None - please see response comment #132	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	133		Policy HO2 Housing Need: where is evidence of need for this type of housing and how would this be assessed in a planning application?	None	Updated supporting evidence base to show local demand derived from the village questionnaire. Current average house size in Stevington is 3.4 bedrooms which is above the current build average of 2.85 (Which Magazine, April 2018) demonstrating a need for smaller housing stock. The housing need (mix) is a common rural issue that has been identified within other local Parish's NDP's, this is strongly documented within the same policies being proposed by our nearest Parish neighbours, Bromham, Oakley and Carlton in their own NDP's.	None - please see response comment #133	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	134		Useful to undertake housing needs assessment or explain clearly where evidence came from: local needs requires clarification for Policy to be effective	None	Updated evidence base to show local demand derived from the village questionnaire, Stevington Parish does not have a development target assigned under the current or emerging Local Plan so the 'target' of 11-15 is an aspiration for the NDP so it is felt that a HNA would not be appropriate at this time	None - please see response comment #134	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	135		Interpretation section reference to imposing conditions on extension of new dwellings. If a concern, should be in a policy and state in what situation this would occur	Edit	Updated references as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	136		Policy HO3 may conflict with government's permitted development rights for conversion of agricultural buildings	None	This Policy only applies where an application would not already fall within the permitted development rights	None - please see response comment #136	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	137		Could add criterion to policy for applicant to supply evidence to demonstrate building is redundant for agricultural use	Edit	Updating wording as suggested in #139 below	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	138		What is meant by 'suitable infrastructure'?	Edit	Expand upon this definition	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	139		Add bullet point 'evidence being provided to demonstrate that the building(s) is redundant for agricultural or commercial purposes'	Edit	Updated wording as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	140		Criterion referring to off road parking needs rewording to make sense with the 'subject to' at the start of the policy	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	141		Policies HO3 and HO4 should include provision that change of use would not harm the significance of a heritage asset, particularly in the case of agricultural buildings which may be statutorily listed or considered a non-designated heritage asset.	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	142		Policy HO4: the sub-division of listed buildings would be subject to a separate process.	None	Agreed, no contradiction being proposed	None - please see response comment #142	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	143		Interpretation section: demolition is controlled through the planning process for buildings over 115 cubic metres	None	Agreed, no contradiction being proposed	None - please see response comment #143	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	144		p37 Interpretation para 3: reword to 'the redevelopment of buildings within the conservation area will need to consider impact on the special interest of the CA as well as the significance of surrounding heritage schemes. Schemes which would result in harm will not usually be supported'	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	145		p35 &36:' new development will not affect designated species or European sites' should be included in Policies HO3/HO4. See BBC comments for suggested text	None	This suggestion contradicts the advice contained within the Parish specific HRA report delivered in January 2019. The NDP has followed the advice with the insertion of the neccasary wording in order to conform to the HRA findings	None - please see response comment #145	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	146		p39: better not to include date for NPPG as continuously updated	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	147		p40: Core Strategy will be replaced by policies in Local Plan 2030; reference to emerging plan Policy 42S might be more relevant	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	148		Reference for 'The Shell Guide to the English Landscape' should be provided	Edit	Review and update as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name	Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Bedford Borough Council	149	p41 policy DH01: if a particular character is to be retained or reflected in new development, this should be made clear in policy. Character assessment or similar document would be useful to evidence this	None	There is no intention to define a particular style only that new development is sympathetic to those buildings in close proximity, especially those considered as Historic Assets	None - please see response comment #149	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	149a	Clarification needed as to what is defined as 'suitable access for people of all abilities'	Edit	Review and update as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	150	Bullet point could be added to policy 'preserving or enhancing the special interest of the CA as well as the significance of heritage assets.	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	151	p42 policy DHO2: title should be 'Non-designated Heritage Assets'	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	152	First bullet point: amend wording to 'it does not cause harm to the significance of the asset'	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	153	Second bullet point: amend wording to 'any proposed alteration to an asset preserves its historical and architectural interest'	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	154	Interpretation section: define the status of a non-designated heritage asset. See BBC comments for suggested wording to replace para 1 of Interpretation	Edit	Review and update as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	155	Explain heritage assets can be of archaeological interest (above & below ground remains) and any development should avoid, minimise & mitigate impacts on these	Edit	Review and update as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	156	Policy DHO3: should be non-permissive policy...Missing words suggest 'proven it would not impede'	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	157	p46 para 5: Government has also published the 25 year Environment Plan in addition to Biodiversity 2020 plan. May be relevant to policies	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	158	p47&48: clarify references to emerging Local Plan 2030, e.g. Policy 38 and 6	Edit	Review and update as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	159	p49: first sentence: para 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 - what do these refer to?	None	Referenced in the paragraph above i.e. Bedford Green Space Strategy, though we have been unable to find a link to this document on the BBC website now	None - please see response comment #159	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	160	p50: Policy EN01 - 'preserve and enhance' rather than 'preserve or enhance'?	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	161	p50 Policy EN01: 4th bullet point: CWS are not necessarily listed for landscape value but due to value with certain habitats.	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	162	Interpretation info should be in Policy, e.g. how to assess their impacts such as assessment carried out by suitably qualified professional such as an ecologist	Edit	Reviewed and updated interpretation as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	163	Interpretation para 3: clarify. Where trees are to be removed, a tree survey should be undertaken by a suitably qualified professional to determine value to locals	Edit	Reviewed and updated interpretation as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	164	p51 Policy EN02: information regarding individual LGS designations should be provided in a separate document or appendix, not in NP	None	This advice is contradictory to the advice given to us by our NDP consultant who advised inclusion of a summary with a more indepth document created as supporting evidence if needed. Given the signifiant reduction in sites it seems more manageable to include them in the main body of the Plan	Note - LGS updated after further advice received from UVE & other NDP groups - v3.01	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	165	Need to provide evidence about how each site meets NPPF criteria; engagement with site owners as to designation; and how sites were selected.	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	166	Policy AD40 not relevant to LGS designation - higher tier of protection and therefor need to be adequately justified.	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	167	Policy AD40 not relevant to NPPF LGS	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	168	p 72 Policy CF01: interpretation section para about replacement facilities should be included in policy as well as list of existing community facilities	Edit	Reviewed and updated interpretation as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	169	Royal George is included; Red Lion could be included now it has reopened.	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	170	p74: SPD for Parking Standards for Sustainable Communities: Design and Practice adopted in 2014, remove reference to draft.	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	171	p75 para 1: Sustainable Drainage Systems SPD adopted in February 2018	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	172	p76&77: road survey and road impact assessment could be included as a background paper, not plan.	Task	Carry forward to second consultation phase	Carried Forward Task	Low	Carried Forward Task
Bedford Borough Council	173	Is T103 justified? NPPF requires all major developments to provide SuDS - evidence may be sought by developers to justify this requirement on all developments	Edit	Reviewed with UVE and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	174	BE01, 3rd bullet point: 'conversion of isolated residential buildings'	Edit	Updated narrative as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Bedford Borough Council	175	BE02 might be more effective if final interpretation para on connectivity statement is included in policy text	Edit	Reviewed and updated as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Historic England	176	Cannot provide detailed comments but refer to guidance on incorporating historic environment considerations into NP; BBC conservation officer and historic records	None	None required <statement only>	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	NA	Completed
Correspondents #10	177	In summary, we would request the following: 1) the removal of the incorrect description of Site D as 'Green Space' 2) the removal of any suggestion that it be re-designated Local Green Space as it meets none of the necessary criteria.	Edit	The LGS Section has been reviewed based on feedback received from the Consultation Phase, it has been agreed that Site D is to be removed from LGS as requested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #2	178	Cranfield	Area Z should not be deemed open space - it has some obvious benefits for developing the area of the Langcroft farm site to fulfil an acceptable need of mixed land uses covering employment, relaxation, community allotment space and suitable homes. Village Benefits for the development of the Langcroft farm yard and adjacent site Z in the document into a community hub extension of the football field facility including housing, allotment, employment 1. Proximity to the Village Hall and sports field. And on the same side of the village as the Baptist Hall at West End. 2. Brown Field site, since the recent order from the enforcement officer stating that the buildings can no longer be used for The Housing of Animals,-(madness on a cattle farm,) it could now be designated a Brown Field site with the Redundant Buildings. 3. Edge of the village, adjacent to the old structure plan boundary. 4. Excellent existing access with full visibility capable of being the future entrance without the removal of hedgerows or other changes to the entrance. 5. Mains Foul Drains running through the site, no road work required for the connections . 6. 3 Phase already on site. 7. Water supply already on site. 8. No change to important views etc as the view line will be extended from the lower edge of the site from the proposed allotments and leisure area bounded by the proposed edge of your potential site Z in the draft . 9. On the Bus route. And main through road. 10. Outside the Conservation Area and away from the historic centre, so little impact on the setting of the village centre. 11. No Public footpaths running through it. 12. No impact on hedges or trees. 13. No interruption of important river panorama and away from vistas of the Windmill or other Historic Features. It would not extend beyond your suggested site Z which the draft document wants as an open view. (along with about 36 other sites!)the open view point will abut it to the south. 14. Not an archaeologically sensitive area.	Edit	The LGS Section has been reviewed based on feedback received from the Consultation Phase, it has been agreed that Site Z is to be removed from LGS as requested. Development sites have not been identified under the current NDP so no comment can be made on the suitability of this proposed site over any other, however it should be noted that a permitted development notification has already been submitted for part of this site to the local LPA	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #2	179	Cranfield	I feel the document potentially has some assumptions in the drafting that are unfounded, possibly unlawful and contradictory to the popular need of the community.	None	The NDP has been based on the feedback and support of the majority of the village residents and businesses that have been engaged from 2015 to 2018, this is further evidenced by the village questionnaire which guided the development of the NDP. No reasoning or examples given to any statement made, it is therefore not possible to provide a further response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #2	180	Cranfield	There seems scant regard for the ingredients that are required to afford this lovely village the opportunities of vibrancy, self-sufficiency across the wider population by almost slamming shut any reasonable and viable expansion opportunities for housing full stop, let alone affordable starter and retirement homes which have I believe have been highlighted as a real wish and requirement in parts of the document by the village population	None	The NDP is actively encouraging sustained development within the current SPA at a level that the village has demonstrated strong support for. The NDP policies on housing mix should ensure due consideration is given to affordable and retirement homes, the external Capacity Review confirms this is a deliverable ambition	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #2	181	Cranfield	Jobs need to be brought to the village or it will die!!.. Existing business operators need the freedom to expand within the locality or they will move out.	None	Opinion statement with no reasoning or examples given, it is therefore not possible to provide a response to this comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #2	182	Cranfield	I feel I should have been personally contacted to discuss my landholding prior to the draft document process as I feel your suggested position and wish list for my land within the document to be allocated as open space has been done in a manner that could and will be challenged .	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #2	183	Cranfield	Given the chance to consider the draft further over the weekend having seen yet another advert stating a new changing closure date of midnight tonight, again by pure coincidence, I was not informed of the extension period or why it was given !!.and feel that all landowners should be informed by legal right !where their properties are being discussed ?,could you please confirm if I am correct in thinking this or am I barking up the wrong tree ??.	None	The extension of the consultation period was at the discretion of the PC and was widely advertised within the village. Mr Kinns had already provided feedback on the plan to the original deadline, his further comments are most welcome. In the interests of clarity the deadline was extended once only and not multiple times as his comment implies	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #2	184	Cranfield	I would be grateful for the opportunity to discuss the draft and the contents of this e mail further but do register a fierce objection to your proposed allocation of your site Z on my property.	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	185	Park Road	In summary we conclude that the SNP fails to meet the basic conditions and in its current form if it proceeded to an examination the examiner would recommend that the SNP be not made.	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	186	Park Road	Only a handful of Neighbourhood plans have failed to meet the basic conditions and these plans are now somewhat notorious.	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	187	Park Road	The scale of the default is so significant that we do not think that the plan can be salvaged by making amendments to the plan in its current form. For example over half the plan relates to local open spaces and only 1 of the 29 sites meets the criteria, so over half the plan will need to be deleted to solve this problem alone.	None	Opinion statement only - please note that the LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed

**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task		
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		188	Park Road		More fundamentally, the SNP completely misses the point of the Neighbourhood planning process – it is not 'positively prepared' but is a negative plan with the main intention of blocking almost all development in the village.	None	Stevington NDP provides for additional development within the Parish beyond the current targets set within the emerging Local Plan, it will not pass inspection if it failed to meet the basic conditions of a NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		188a	Park Road		Additionally, the consultation process was wholly inadequate and contrary to the NPPF, and the current Parish Council group do not have the resources to prepare a proper plan.	None	The professional advice that we have received is that we have met all of our obligations under Regulation 14, the consultation period was extended primarily to ensure all interested parties had access to any supporting relevant documentation	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		189	Park Road		These 3 shortcomings are so significant that we can only recommend that the plan be withdrawn entirely and either • a new group be formed to start again and create a new plan which meets the intention of the Neighbourhood planning concept and NPPF and the needs of the village or • Stevington PC accepts that for a village of c600 people to carry out such a significant and onerous planning challenge, the demands of which have significantly grown in the period over which the plan has been in progress, requires some justification. Given that the Bedford Borough 2030 is already at examination and will meet most of the concerns covers in this plan, it is reasonable for the PC to recommend that it is no longer necessary that a neighbourhood plan for Stevington be progressed.	None	The PC continue to believe that the NDP represents the best interests and wishes of the vast majority of village	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		190	Park Road		We do not want our village to be marked out as failing to prepare an adequate plan. This would be embarrassing and will likely mean that the possibility of ever creating a successful plan is remote. The worse case scenario is that a draft plan is published and submitted for examination, including the identified need for additional housing, and on examination is not recommended to be made, as this leaves the village vulnerable to development about which it has no say, including location, design and scale – effectively a housing free for all.	None	The professional advice that we have received is that we have met all of our obligations under Regulation 14 and will ensure we are compliant before submitting the revised Plan to Regulation 16	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		191	Park Road		Should the plan proceed to examination we will strongly urge the Examiner to hold a public meeting on this plan and themselves manage the communication to ensure that all interested parties, in particular landowners and their agents, are finally made aware of this plan and have the opportunity to participate in the consultation.	None	The Plan consultation for Regulation 16 is managed by BBC as the LPA, public meetings are at the discretion of the Inspector	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		192	Park Road		HO1 - The SNP has identified a need for 11 to 15 houses. The SNP fails to identify any development sites. The policy fails the basic conditions. The whole point of a Neighbourhood plan is to direct and deliver sustainable development. This policy needs to be rewritten on the basis of actual agreed proposed sites for development.	None	The 'target' of 11-15 houses is aspirational but is fully support by the independent Capacity Report utilising the options recommended	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		192a	Park Road		The preamble to the policy state that there has been a capacity review which states the following: "In order to meet future development demands in the Village, the Parish Council wanted to ensure that there was sufficient capacity within the current SPA to meet our Plan target of delivering 11-15 new dwellings through to 2035." No planning evidence has been provided to support 11-15 houses. The SNP stated "this is the median number most widely supported by the residents".	Edit	The plan has been updated to further clarify the aspirational target for development, the Capacity Report confirms that this is an achievable aim	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		192b	Park Road		Additionally the policy is contradictory to the Report carried out on behalf of the PC by Urban Vision Enterprises UVE. They suggest that there should also be development of some Farm Yards outside the SPA. The UVE report states that further development in the SPA (Silver Street or Church Road) would cause adverse traffic issues and is therefore limited and will not deliver the required number of sites.	None	The 'target' of 11-15 houses is aspirational but is fully supported by the independent Capacity Report utilising the options recommended, Policies have been drafted in conjunction with our NDP consultant to ensure they are complementary and able to support future development opportunities,	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		192c	Park Road		The Policy fails to identify any sites and there has been no call for sites.	None	The 'target' of 11-15 houses is aspirational but is fully supported by the independent Capacity Report utilising the options recommended, Policies have been drafted in conjunction with our NDP consultant to ensure they are complementary and able to support future development opportunities. A wider call for sites was not therefore deemed neccasary or appropriate at this time	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		192d	Park Road		The capacity report from UVE does identify some sties but no engagement with the village or landowners has been carried out to progress these potential sites. The policy is therefore undeliverable. The Policy makes no defence to local sites or local requirements	None	The UVE Capacity Report supports the potential commerical capacity of the agricultural sites identified outside of the SPA, recent planning applications at Park Farm and Lancroft Farm prove that there is an appetite to utilise this type of development within the Parish	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed



**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name	Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	192e	Park Road The Policy and its preamble make no reference to any NPPF policies. NPPF is predicated on a strong presumption of sustainable development including outside any SPA as appropriate. This policy therefore does not meet the basic conditions regarding the NPPF The Policy restricts development to the SPA. However the UVE report states that the 11 to 15 houses cannot be delivered in the SPA. Therefore the policy does not contribute to sustainable development. The SNP has identified a need for 11 to 15 houses. The SNP fails to identify any development sites. The policy fails the basic conditions. The whole point of a Neighbourhood plan is to direct and deliver sustainable development. This policy needs to be rewritten on the basis of actual agreed proposed sites for development.	None	The SPA designation has not been defined by the NPPF but has been created by Bedford Borough Council as part of the Local Plan, currently under LP 2002 as amended, but also remains intact as Policy within the emerging LP 2030. Stevington NDP does not look to contradict this designation. The remainder of this comment is duplication of points made above, please see comments #192b, #192c and #192d	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193	Park Road HO2 - The Policy is inadequate and lacks clarity and an evidence base, and without allocated site is not deliverable.	None	All proposed Policies have been reviewed by BBC and our NDP consultant, please see comment #192d re sites	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193a	Park Road The Policy implies that the only type of housing suitable for Stevington is smaller and old people housing. Is this what was intended?	None	This Policy is expressing a preference that has been highlighted to the NPWG via the engagement events and questionnaire responses, this requirement is not unique to Stevington and has been identified in several North Bedfordshire Parish's NDP's	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193b	Park Road What does predominantly mean?	None	Mainly, for the most part	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193c	Park Road What should the spread be?	None	The Policy is not looking to be prescriptive, development options would depend on several criteria such as site size etc. SPC encourage Developers to meet with them to discuss any proposal	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193d	Park Road There is very weak evidence for this policy. It ignores the evidence in the questionnaire responses which refer to need for accommodation for young people	None	The Policy is not looking to be prescriptive and is not limiting development to older person housing, SPC encourage Developers to meet with them to discuss any proposal	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193e	Park Road The Policy does not make reference to any local characteristics	None	The Policy is not looking to be prescriptive but does require new development to be sympathetic to the buildings surrounding it, especially Listed or Historic Assets	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193f	Park Road The Policy makes no reference to the NPPF policies	None	NPPF is only referenced where it has relevance	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193g	Park Road The Policy does not actively encourage development, or state how this could be achieved, or offer any support for development, therefore does not actively support sustainable development	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	193a	Park Road The Policy is inadequate and lacks clarity and an evidence base, and without allocated site is not deliverable.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response, please see comment #192d re sites	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194	Park Road HO3 - The Policy is unclear and does not take regard to the NPPF, does not support sustainable development, and is therefore does not meet the basic conditions and should be deleted and replaced by a more appropriate and detailed policy which applies to the potential development sites in the village.	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194a	Park Road The Policy does not refer to brownfield sites, which are mentioned in the preamble.	None	Correct, it was not felt that a specific additional policy was required for brownfield sites	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194b	Park Road What it the definition of a "permanent structure"?	None	All Policies have an Interpretation section to help understand the intention of the Policy statement, the noted definition is detailed there	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194c	Park Road This policy does not make it clear whether the only dwellings permitted must also comply with policy H02	None	All development must comply with all Policies in a NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194d	Park Road It also does not state if these sites must be within the SPA or not.	None	All Policies have an Interpretation section to help understand the intention of the Policy statement, the question on the SPA is detailed there	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194e	Park Road What is meant by suitable infrastructure, and does it need to be in place before or after development?	<b>Edit</b>	Wording reviewed and updated for clarity, we are not looking to be restrictive so would defer to best build practice	<b>Plan revised - v 4.0</b>	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194f	Park Road What does compromising or restricting mean?	<b>Edit</b>	Expand upon this definition	<b>Plan revised - v 4.0</b>	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194g	Park Road The Policy does not identify any specific sites, even though the UVE report does identify specific sites	None	The UVE report is looking at capacity potential only, please see all comments under #192 for further detail	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194h	Park Road The Policy does not make any reference to any local characteristics or sites	None	The Policy is not looking to be prescriptive but does require new development to be sympathetic to the buildings surrounding it, especially Listed or Historic Assets	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194i	Park Road The Policy makes no reference to the NPPF including reference to rural exception sites, and paragraphs 77 to 79 – the policy is more restrictive than the NPPF and no justification for this departure from the NPPF is given.	None	NPPF is only referenced where it has relevance, Rural Exceptions are usually dealt with at LP level not within a NDP, no evidence provided to support the statement as to why the Policy is 'more restrictive' so unable to provide further comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed



**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194j	Park Road	The Policy does not contribute to sustainable development as it is unduly restrictive	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence provided to support the statement as to why the Policy is 'more restrictive' so unable to provide further comment	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	194k	Park Road	The Policy is unclear and does not take regard to the NPPF, does not support sustainable development, and is therefore does not meet the basic conditions and should be deleted and replaced by a more appropriate and detailed policy which applies to the potential development sites in the village	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195	Park Road	DH02 - Policy is ambiguous and unclear. Delete	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195a	Park Road	Is this in affect the SNP’s own policy of how to control the conservation area, and furthermore to create its own definition of listed Building?	None	Planning decisions with respect to the Conservation Area will be dealt with by the LPA (BBC) not SPC, SPC has no plans to nominate any additional buildings within the Parish for considered for Listed Building status although obviously private individuals are more than welcome to do so	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195b	Park Road	What are local architectural or historical interest?	None	Those structures that contribute to the historical or architectural heritage of the village	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195c	Park Road	It will include a wider area than the conservation area?	None	The Policy would apply to the designated NDP area in this case the Parish of Stevington	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195d	Park Road	What makes it a Non-designated Heritage building? How are these decided? Who is making this decision, are they qualified planners?	None	Interpretation would be the responsibility of the Government recognised LPA	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195e	Park Road	Is the SMP trying to apply listed building status to all houses in Stevington?	None	Please see response to comment #195a	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	195f	Park Road	What is the list of non-designated assets – unclear?	None	Question only - we are not aware of a list of non-designated assets in the NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196	Park Road	DH03 - Evidence is fundamentally flawed as the windmill is not in use and there are no plans to bring it back to use, so it does not need a wind corridor. Recommendation - Policy should be deleted.	None	The comments made are factually incorrect. The windmill has recently undergone significant renovation (Dorothea Restorations April to Oct 2018) with the explicit intention of allowing the sails to be set and turned in the future, this represented a significant financial investment by BBC. A schedule of maintenance has been created by Dorothea and SPC are in discussions with BBC as to how best to implement this going forward, further rennovation is scheduled on the main sail stocks over the winter 2019 with a view to replacing them in 2020.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196a	Park Road	The Policy is not clear and unambiguous. It is grammatically incorrect.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196b	Park Road	The plan provided has no key or explanation for the diagram.	Edit	Wording reviewed and updated for clarity	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196c	Park Road	By reading the Dutch report which is referred to as support for the policy it appears that only the blue section of the diagram is the actual wind rose that that could affect the windmill if it were be built on, not the circles on the map. Yet elsewhere in the SNP the policy is used to support prevention of development in the whole of the circle around the mill – do the authors themselves actually understand this policy? NB If it is the whole circle then there are already dozens of houses built in the wind corridor, many of which are over a hundred years old.	Edit	Wording reviewed and image updated for clarity, the diagram represents the highest average wind speeds and from which direction, this should help guide the relatively likelihood of a development impacting the wind corridor	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196d	Park Road	The policy is already being misused in the report itself - on page 59 in evidence for the designation of Site N as a Local Green Space "This site is historically important as it forms part of the wind corridor for the Grade II* listed windmill." Not only is site N not in the blue section of the map but a wind corridor is not something which is 'historically important' and land is not 'part of a wind corridor' – the wind is the wind corridor.	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196e	Park Road	The Policy is based around a single Dutch website which refers to a concept which applies to wind turbines, not windmills / post mills.	None	Wind turbines and windmills differ only by residual product not by the source of energy required hence the conclusions drawn are compatible	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196f	Park Road	It is not supported by any evidence of wind corridors relevant to this mill. It is not clear if the wind rose calculations have been prepared by a professional, or a member of the Stevington Parish Council. The diagram is said to be based on “average direction and speed from Jan 1997 to Dec 2016 (data supplied by the Met Office Ltd Jan 2018” but this data has not been included and it has not been possible to verify or challenge the evidence.	None	The Policy does not prevent development within the wind corridor, what it requires is that evidence is provided at time of planning application that demonstrates that the development does not adversely impact the working of the mill. The wind rose is a diagram was supplied by the Met Office upon request, this service is open to all and can be verified with them if desired	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196g	Park Road	All the land to the north of the Windmill is lower than the ground where it stands, i.e. it drops towards Park Road and the village. This has not been taken into account in the evidence.	None	Please see response comment #196f	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196h	Park Road	The explanation refers to houses of an average of 8-10m in height. Most of the houses in the area are less than 8m high.	None	Please see response comment #196f	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196i	Park Road	Most significantly no evidence has been presented as to the need for the Stevington Windmill to have a wind corridor at all. Comments elsewhere in the SNP are factually incorrect, and imply that the Windmill is working. It is not, it is in fact a defunct Windmill.	None	The statements made are factually incorrect please see comment response #196	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196j	Park Road	Page 13 of the SNP describes the mill as being the “last remaining example of a working windmill in the County”. It is not a working mill.	None	The statement made is factually incorrect please see comment response #196	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196k	Park Road	Bedford Borough describe the mill as follows: The windmill operated commercially, mostly grinding cattle feed, until 1939. It was purchased and restored in 1951 by Bedfordshire County Council, as part of the County's contribution to the Festival of Britain. Stevington Windmill was probably the last windmill in Britain working with four common (cloth covered) sails, which were replaced 2004. The sails are turned periodically and the machinery, though requiring constant maintenance, is in rough working order. <a href="https://www.bedford.gov.uk/leisure-and-culture/arts-and-culture/history-and-heritage/stevington-mill/">https://www.bedford.gov.uk/leisure-and-culture/arts-and-culture/history-and-heritage/stevington-mill/</a> The Borough Council description shows that the windmill is no longer used, stating it 'was' the last working mill, not 'is' the last working mill. It is kept locked up ad there is no cloth on the sails. The sails are covered in cloth and the sails are turned (they are not, it is understood, turned by the wind, they are turned manually) a mere couple of times a year, the windmill is not actually 'in use'. If the windmill was turned by the wind it would actually fall apart	None	The opinion statements made are factually incorrect please see comment response #196	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196l	Park Road	This policy is very specific to Stevington and its unique characteristics. However the policy itself is 'wrong headed', as the windmill is disused and does not need a wind corridor. There are far more interesting and relevant policies which could be introduced, for example policies to encourage access to the mill, promote it outside the area, provide support for its maintenance etc.	None	The NDP gives communities the opportunity to introduce tailored local planning policies that are specific to their location, this is the purpose of this Policy i.e. to preserve a unique hertige asset for future generations. Promition and Management of the Mill are not planning matters but are being discussed with BBC. Opinion statements made with respect to condition are factually incorrect please see comment response #196	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	196m	Park Road	The Policy contributes nothing to sustainable development. Indeed it appears to be a 'device' which has been created merely to further restriction development anywhere near the windmill, and has already been used in this way in the report itself in relation to the designation of Site N as a Local Green Space. The Policy is entirely wrong headed should be deleted.	None	Please see response comment #196l	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	197	Park Road	T101 - The Policy is unclear and does not contribute to alleviating traffic impact in any meaningful way.	None	Please see response comment #185	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	197a	Park Road	What does "particular regard to ensuring that.." mean? These 2 roads already have traffic problems, as agreed by Urban Vision Enterprise <sic> Housing Stevington Capacity Study. What is the traffic policy for the village? How will these points be measured for an application? SNP states that there has not been a formal traffic census, and so there is not precise data on traffic movements and volumes. So what is the benchmark for the impact of a new development. This would not hold up in formal planning appeal. There is No proposals to help alleviate parking in the village. What are the heritage assets referred to? There is No definition of the heritage assets. If visibility is ok, i.e. not being restricted, why stop a planning application if there is already other cars parked on the highway? In the SNP informal jottings of road impact assessment, traffic from other development in other villages is mentioned, surely that is an issue for BB, and for the PC to tackle them about it, not a reason to prevent development in this village.	None	"particular regard to ensuring that" means that traffic impact must be a consideration of any proposed development. Policies in a NDP relate to development only - they are not designed to set any specific 'traffic policy' though parking recommendations can and have been made to help alleviate issues with on street parking Alleviation of traffic issues are not within the remit of the NDP. Heritage assets are those that hold a national designation. Appropriate access would be assessed by BBC Highways Department, it is not an element of a NDP Please see response to comment #185	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198	Park Road	T102 - The Policy is unclear, undeliverable and appears to merely be another obstacle to development.	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198a	Park Road	SNP suggests the need for bungalows for elderly people who wish to down size. Not all elderly people are able to ride a bicycle. So would the development of housing for the elderly need the Cycle storage?	None	The health benefit of an active lifestyle is undisputed and is strongly recommended by Government, the NHS and health charities, it is presumptuous to assume older people are incapable of cycling, or that future owners of any new dwelling would be so impaired	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198b	Park Road	How many cycles per household?	None	The Policy is not looking to be prescriptive but encourage best practice	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198c	Park Road	What is secure?	None	Fixed or fastened so as not to give way, become loose, or be lost	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198d	Park Road	Even within the SPA there are significant areas with no pavements! Windmill Lane has no pavement; much of Court Lane has no right hand pavement on 3 quarters of its length, much of Park Road has no pavement. So how can virtually any development connect to a pavement?. How can you lay a pavement if you don't own the land to the pavement.	None	Any new development would likely require access to the road network, this Policy looks to ensure that adequate consideration is given to providing footpaths to/from that network	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198e	Park Road	Is this policy yet another means to prevent development?	None	Question only - we don't see how it can be but as with all Policies will be reviewed and confirmed with our consultant and LPA before Reg 16 submission	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	198a	Park Road	The Policy is unclear, undeliverable and appears to merely be another obstacle to development.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199	Park Road	EN01 - Very ambiguous policy. No evidence base. Already covered by Local plan strategic policies so unnecessary and potentially inconsistent with these policies. CWS sites are stated to specifically not restrict landowners Recommendation: delete	None	Opinion statement only - the NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199b	Park Road	Where are these sites? No Map has been provided showing these locations, nor does the following website	None	Question only - Site maps are generally not available as most are privately owned and therefore not in the public domain. The LPA will have definitive reference maps if needed	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199b	Park Road	But it does clarify their legal standing, which should be mentioned in the SNP so people understand that there is No right to access, and should not affect ordinary agricultural operations	None	Opinion statement only - the NDP deals with planning considerations only, not matters of access or land operation etc	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199d	Park Road	<a href="https://www.wildlifebcn.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/bedfordshire_county_wildlife_sites.pdf">https://www.wildlifebcn.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/bedfordshire_county_wildlife_sites.pdf</a> How are landowners affected?	None	The Policy does not place any additional restrictions on the land owner or managers of the sites listed, the Policy simply requires that future development does not have an impact on any of these sites	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199e	Park Road	If intensification of land use is being considered it may be necessary to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment under the 2006 Regulations. For more information on the Regulations call the Natural England free phone EIA helpline on 0800 028 2140. It is important to be aware that the recognition of a site as a CWS does NOT confer any new rights of access either to the general public or conservation organisations. Ordinary agricultural operations remain unaffected and identification of a CWS does NOT give anyone other than the landowner or manager control over land management. CWS recognition is non-statutory, but is recognition of a site's high value for biodiversity. The Wildlife Trust, Local Authorities and other organisations are working to protect and enhance such sites in co-operation with land owners and land managers." Where and when was your consultation and co-operation with Land Owners and Managers?	None	The Policy does not place any additional restrictions on the land owner or managers of the sites listed, the Policy simply requires that future development does not have an impact on any of these sites, therefore consultation would be unnecessary given there is no impact on owners or managers what so ever	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199f	Park Road	The SNP Can not have a blanket policy which prevents any development which will have any impact on any animal plant tree or hedge	None	Correct, the proposed Plan makes no such restriction	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199g	Park Road	Why not use a normal tree survey?	None	The Policy is not looking to be prescriptive, provided the report is produced by a recognised professional then it should be accepted by the LPA	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199g	Park Road	The definition of a tree is too arbitrary	None	No definition of a tree is given in the Plan narrative	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199h	Park Road	Network is a ridiculous definition	None	All Policy wording has been reviewed with BBC as the LPA, as they will have to interpret the definition then providing they are comfortable with it then it would be deemed fit for purpose	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199i	Park Road	What if the landowner planted the hedge themselves 3 years ago and need to put a gateway in it – this would be not allowed! Yet it is under Agricultural Law. This policy would encourage all landowners to destroy any such 'natural assets' which is allowed in law, prior to making a planning application. Surely this is not the intention of the SNP	None	The Policy requires there to be 'no significant adverse impact' on the natural environment, it does not state that there can be no impact. We can not comment further on hypothetical situations	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	199a	Park Road	As no doubt you are aware, if the SNP is to vary from the Local Plan then there must be evidence to show why you need a local policy. Where is this evidence specific to Stevington? The CWS sites you mention cover vital areas and already protected, but what specific hedges, riversides, trees etc are relevant to Stevington? new Local Plan (2030) policies 36S and 43S, are strategic policies and as such will still have full force on Stevington, so why is Policy EN01 necessary?	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200	Park Road	EN02 - No regard to NPPF – no reference to the NPPF criteria.	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200a	Park Road	Policy in contradiction of NPPF policy re green spaces	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task		
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200b	Park Road		No robust evidence base, evidence is inaccurate, weak and actually demonstrates lack of compliance with the criteria – Beds Borough Council evaluation rejected all but one site	None	No evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response, for the second part the review of the original LGS submission for the old Local Plan formed the basis of the LGS section of the NDP and will be reviewed against current evidence (the original blanket rejection was challenged at the time)	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200c	Park Road		Lack of openness and potential bias and favouritism	None	No evidence for this accusation is provided so we are unable to provide a response now, we would welcome further dialog on this topic with the respondents and can provide a further comment once we have reviewed the evidence they have	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200d	Park Road		Policy clearly designed to prevent sustainable development – fails to meet the basic conditions. • The policy should be deleted • Due to this policy accounting for almost 50% of the entire plan the plan itself should be withdrawn as it fails to meet the basic conditions	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200e	Park Road		The Policy is reasonably clear but unnecessarily poorly worded. It is not clear why the term built is included prior to the term development, which is itself an unambiguous planning term. Does it mean that developments which comprise not 'built' say groundworks are not included in the scope of the policy?	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable. NDP's relate only to works that require planning applications to be submitted.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200f	Park Road		It is not clear what open means, does it preclude planting of trees and hedges? Are they allowed ever to be not green – one of the sites currently is not green most of the time as the field is not tended and is sprayed with glyphosate at least once a year to clear it of vegetation.	None	NDP's relate only to works that require planning applications to be submitted	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200g	Park Road		The policy only permits small development to support the community use of the land. Yet on almost all of the sites there is NO current community use of the land and it is privately owned.	Edit	Opinion statement only - the revised LGS section deals with the public access issue	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200h	Park Road		A very poor attempt has been made to provide evidence to support the designations	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200i	Park Road		In the first instance a cursory look at the map and the number of sites, 29, for a village of 700 people indicates that the aim of the policy is to ring fence the village to prevent development and is not based on any facts and evidence	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200j	Park Road		It is unclear how the sites were selected in the first place. For example Is there a reason for why Duck end was not included, even though that is where some development was applied for which virtually the whole village objected to?	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups, the initial LGS sites were identified during an exercise undertaken between SPC and BBC for responses to the then emerging Local Plan. The initial SPC response was based on review of the spaces and input from residents and local interest groups, this has since be reviewed based on experiences of other NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200k	Park Road		There are clear inconsistencies where some land has been excluded from the designation whilst other land owned by different individuals has been included but which could have the same (albeit weak) evidence base applied to it. Strangely, at least 4 of the sites suggested are visible or even touch property owned by Parish Councillors, yet no interest in these designations has been declared. The possibility of potential bias and favouritism has to be raised.	None	No evidence for this accusation is provided so we are unable to provide a response now, we would welcome further dialog on this topic with the respondents and can provide a further comment once we have reviewed the evidence they have to substantiate their claims	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200l	Park Road		The SNP refers in all cases to the village questionnaire and the fact that the responses support the designation. The actual wording of the question has not however been included in the SNP, nor published on the plan website, nor provide despite being asked for several times. Our own recollection is that no definition Local Green Space was provided to questionnaires, they were not asked if the land met the conditions or to provide evidence to support their designations. They were presented in meetings alongside the call for sites responses, with the clear implication that the designation was intended to prevent development and the community were encouraged to understand their responses in this light. The questionnaire responses must therefore be discounted as having no evidential weight.	None	The Local Green Space submission has been revised based on the feedback received from the Consultation Phase, supporting evidence will be provided inline with the NPPF guidelines and inclusion (or not) will be confirmed by the independent inspector "They were presented in meetings alongside the call for sites responses, with the clear implication that the designation was intended to prevent development and the community were encouraged to understand their responses in this light" - no evidence has been provided by the respondents to this statement so we can not comment on unsubstantiated allegation Villagers were asked if they supported each proposed site for inclusion within the plan as LGS, the level of support was used to identify which sites should be go forward to further analysis and validation against NPPF Sites have been assessed against working group's interpretation of the NPPF requirements, no nationally accepted methodology exists for LGS	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12		200m	Park Road		Most significantly no reference has been made to the evaluation of the sites carried out by the Borough using its own methodology. The PC were specifically asked to provide and to publish this evaluation on the SNP website. The PC refused. The document was obtained directly from Bedford Borough Council Planning Policy team for this report	None	Opinion statement only - please see response comment #200j with respect to the original LGS return to BBC. As previously confirmed, the LGS submission is not a supporting document for the NDP so its reference here is irrelevant. It should be further noted that BBC did not have a defined LGS methodology at the time of the original submission, this was the main reason for the challenge to their initial proposed designations	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed



**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200n	Park Road	The BBC review found that only one site, the playing field called Site E in the SNP met the criteria. The PC have explicitly decided not to publicise this review, despite it being prima facie evidence that all but one of the sites do not meet the NPPF criteria and should not be designated. No evidence is therefore included to refute or dispute the Borough evaluation. The Borough discussed their evaluation with the PC and this discussion has not been published. This lack of openness and transparency is of great concern.	None	Please see response comment #200j with respect to the original LGS return to BBC. As previously confirmed, the LGS submission is not a supporting document for the NDP so its reference here is irrelevant. It should be further noted that BBC did not have a defined LGS methodology at the time of the original submission, this was the main reason for the challenge to their initial proposed designations	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200o	Park Road	The evidence refers to parish rights of way numbers. However there is no ROW map included in the SNP or on the website. The Parish Council has been asked where these numbers can be found, and to publish their own sources but the question was not answered and the information not made available	None	RoW are managed by the local LPA and they will have any copies of maps if so needed, they are not referenced within the NDP as a supporting document so can not be reasonably be expected to be produced on individual demand	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200p	Park Road	The evidence, as it is, is mostly anecdotal, speculative and is sloppy containing numerous factual inaccuracies. For example the Stevington Belt is referred to as an ancient wood which it is not, the routes of the Bunyan Trail and Ouse Valley Way are incorrectly described, and claimed views to and across the land are not visible from points of public access	None	The statements made will be validated by Independent inspection, the details provided are true to the best of our knowledge	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200q	Park Road	Examiners have repeatedly emphasised the need to provide evidence relating to all 3 of the NPPF criteria and their reports provide guidance as to the type of land the NPPF is intended to protect and what it is not, and the nature of the evidence required. For example Chapel-en-le-Frith: Examiner Janet Cheesley re Target Wall Field,: "169. The site is in a countryside location on the outskirts of the settlement, projecting into the wider countryside. As such, the character of the site is as part of the surrounding countryside, rather than local in character. Whilst there is public access along the footpaths, and these footpaths appear to be well used by the local community, there are many areas of countryside where footpaths allow public access. 170. It is not the purpose of the Local Green Space designations to include countryside land that provides wider views of the countryside."	None	The LGS section has been reviewed and updated based on discussions with our NDP consultant and the experiences of local NDP groups who have been through the inspection process	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200r	Park Road	The NPPF requires Local Green Spaces to be demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance. Almost all the sites have no special local significance and a merely large agricultural fields. Some are people's gardens, most have no public access to them.	None	The LGS section has been reviewed and updated based on discussions with our NDP consultant and the experiences of local NDP groups who have been through the inspection process	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200s	Park Road	The Policy and its preamble reference the NPPF policy but very significantly do not cite the criteria in the policy which must be met in order for the sites to be designated. Most of the sites do not meet the criteria of the NPPF.	None	The LGS section has been reviewed and updated based on discussions with our NDP consultant and the experiences of local NDP groups who have been through the inspection process	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200t	Park Road	Per the NPPF Local Green Spaces are akin to Green Belt and policies related to them must comply with the Green Belt policies in the NPPF. The SNP makes no reference to this requirement in the NPPF or to the NPPF Green Belt policy 145. Policy EN02 is substantially different from NPPF 145 and is attempting to create its own definition of green belt.	None	The NDP will only be submitted for Regulation 16 after confirmation from our professional advisor and BBC Planning Department that it meets the basic conditions, is lawful and enforceable	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200u	Park Road	The Government Guidelines for implementing the NPPF states that Landlords should be consulted on the proposals for these sites. Many of the land owners canvassed for this report had no consultation whatsoever from the PC or the SNP committee, nor have some of them who live outside the village been invited to comment about the report. This is clearly in breach	None	The LGS section has been reviewed and updated based on discussions with our NDP consultant and the experiences of local NDP groups who have been through the inspection process, we will ensure all interested parties are made aware of the consultation phase, especially those who have ownership of any proposed LGS	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200v	Park Road	This policy is deliberately designed to prevent sustainable development - it is a blanket back door approach to turn at least 3 ends of the village into a vast swathe of Green Belt. Wrapping all but Duck End in a frozen time warp. It is more restrictive than NPPF 145 Green Belt. It clearly contributes nothing to sustainable development and fails to meet this basic condition	None	The LGS section was created with full consultation with the Parish community and looked to be representative of their wishes, having received further advice we have revised the LGS section and will run the pre-consultation Regulation Phase 14 again	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	200w	Park Road	The Policy very significantly fails to meet the basic conditions. Given that this is almost half the content of the whole plan it is hard to see how it cannot mean that the entire plan should be withdrawn	None	LGS is only one of fifteen Policies identified in the Plan and is being revised in line with current advice, scrapping the whole plan based on a single revision would seem to be a somewhat disproportionate response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201	Park Road	CF01 - No evidence base or evaluation criteria. Delete or provide evaluation criteria and evidence base and revise the list as appropriate.	None	Evidence base is stated within the NDP document, identified during the engagement events and evidenced via the village questionnaire	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201a	Park Road	The Policy does not make it clear what is community use	None	Expectation would be that the current community use would continue in whichever form it currently occurs	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201b	Park Road	The list of properties is inconsistent, for example one pub but not the other one is listed, a privately owned workshop but it is not clear why this as opposed to any other premises is listed – the list is arbitrary as there is no definition in the policy	None	All properties listed were identified initially by the working group through local knowledge and interaction with villagers, these were then refined during the public engagement activities where the residents confirmed support for their inclusion. At the time the list was created the Red Lion future was unknown, we are pleased to be able to remedy that in the latest version of the plan	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201c	Park Road	On page 72 about the Community Facilities, there is mention at the of Non-designated facilities, is this really part of Policy DO02 and wrongly positioned in the paper, or is it deliberate? What is the rationale for including the last paragraph in this section, re Non-designated facilities, is this to do with Non-designated Heritage in Policy DH02	None	No, the listing is deliberate it makes the distinction between those community facilities that are noted but already have a planning related designation and those that are listed but don't	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201d	Park Road	There is no evidence to support the inclusion of any particular building, which would in any case be difficult as there is no evaluation criteria. It is particularly concerning that the Red Lion Pub has been omitted, despite this being the dominating the comments in the Questionnaire and being the first assets to be list as a Community assets in Bedford Borough. We have to ask is this due to the PC forgetting to include the pub as it was for many years closed but is now open	None	Please see response to comments #201b and #201c	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201e	Park Road	NB the other pub in the village, the Royal George, is party owned by a resident of the village. The owners of the properties have not been consulted	None	All residents and businesses have been kept informed of all progress of the NDP and have been invited to review and comment at each stage. The Royal George has been kind enough to hold a copy of the plan and keep a comments box for us, so we are surprised that you feel they have not been consulted	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201f	Park Road	Why is the Methodist church on here – not a church for over 60 or even years, no public access private owned, workshop since 1979, prior to that was a potatoe <sic> store for a local farmer. For just 3 years it was rented to someone who tried to make a business, but it didn't pay and legally the property has permission only for a workshop. Surely the SNP cannot say something is a community asset just because someone works in it and invites people in to view the work	None	Please see comment response #201b.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	201g	Park Road	By contrast why haven't the Barns where X-mass trees are sold been designated, or Kathy Brown's garden because she has open gardens and runs a business there. Both these are similarly open to the Public but not as a hall or a facility. The policy does reflect the local context but is inconsistent and biased. This policy is again restricting the sustainable development in the village	None	Please see comment response #201b, neither the Barn nor Gardens mentioned were identified as being of note for inclusion at any of the engagement events to date hence they are not listed	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202	Park Road	BE01 - Not clear and unambiguous. Policy does not line up to the stated aim of supporting proportionate growth and a thriving local economy; policy contradicts stated evidence base of the questionnaire by introducing further restriction to existing buildings or businesses	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202a	Park Road	Lacks evidence and contains no local relevance – a wasted opportunity	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202b	Park Road	No regard for NPPF – more restrictive without justification	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202c	Park Road	Does not contribute to sustainable development	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202d	Park Road	Aim appears actually to impose further restrictions on development. Recommendation: Delete	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202e	Park Road	The policy is very unclear, ambiguous and muddled.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202f	Park Road	Facilities is not a planning term	None	Opinion statement only	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202g	Park Road	What does 'within existing business' mean. Within does that mean existing premises?	None	Businesses and existing premises are not expected to be mutually exclusive	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202h	Park Road	What formal leisure facilities already exist in the village? There are none	None	Public Houses, the Village Hall, Church Room, Baptist Hall, Sailing Club, Camping Site etc are all examples of what could be considered as leisure facilities or have the ability to host leisure events	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202i	Park Road	The definition on the SNP mentions not in a group or a row. What is the definition of a group?	None	A group of buildings would be considered if they are located, gathered, or classed together	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202j	Park Road	If there are individual detached houses in a road, are they isolated?	None	In relation to dwellings outside the SPA, yes	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202k	Park Road	If a particular type of new rural business activity is proposed, which needs a purpose built building, the wording suggests that it would be refused planning. Is this the intention? For example Flowers from the Farm is a very successful concept dedicated to sustainable local flower production but it is not currently in Stevington and would require development to set up e.g. glass houses and packaging facilities	None	The NDP is not looking to be more restrictive than current planning legislation (this will be determined by the LPA prior to Regulation 16). In the example provided exiting agricultural development rights exist that would potentially allow for this scenario	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202l	Park Road	This sustainable ecological rural business would be prohibited by this policy	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202m	Park Road	This refers to existing businesses and additional facilities – is there a list of all such businesses etc - as you need a starting point	None	No list has been created as it is not deemed neccasary or relevant to a NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202n	Park Road	The preamble refers to “Stevington has developed a thriving range of local businesses, many of which are home based” but the policy will eliminate growth of further residential businesses as the policy limits them to conversion from isolated residential buildings only. Hence for example if a resident wanted permission to build say an annex in their garden from which to run the following from their home this would be prevented by this policy o dog grooming parlour o hairdressing salon o holiday let o IT programming consultancy o tutoring service o massage salon o fitness training suite o jewellery making o catering bread beer cake eggs o internet retail business o etc etc etc	None	Businesses that already reside within the SPA will have the option of expansion under current regulation, expansion outside of the SPA would already generally require consultation with the LPA, the NDP does not look to change or restrict that requirement	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202o	Park Road	The only evidence presented to back up the need for this policy is the Stevington questionnaire. This questionnaire did not consult on the policy itself. The policy actually contradicts the evidence cited from the questionnaire. For example “new developments should be designed to support working from home – 98% agreed” however the policy makes no mention of working from home and indeed by restricting conversion to isolated residences only actively prevents the creation of working from home opportunities.	None	The questionnaire provides the evidence to inform the Policy creation process, regular updates and informal reviews have been conducted to ensure the draft Plan meets local expectations and needs, the Reg 14 consultation process allows for final feedback on Policies ahead of the plan submission.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202p	Park Road	No justification for Stevington to departure from the NPPF policy and advice	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202q	Park Road	Indeed given the pre-ambule there is every justification for Stevington to have a more flexible and wider policy to support business employment and tourism There is nothing in this policy which references the locality of Stevington. The key feature of Stevington is the Windmill. This is plastered across most of the Borough and Parish publications especially relating to tourism and visitors. Yet the policy says nothing in relation to the Windmill and opportunities to encourage development which makes the most for the village and visitors of this landmark, for example with holiday accommodation (campsite, bnb, caravans etc). Some such development is certain to increase the viability of the 2 pubs. Some types of development (e.g. a campsite) could in themselves be sufficient to support a real shop in the village, something which was repeatedly asked for in the responses to the questionnaire and is not referred to in the evidence for this policy.	None	Stevington already has a camping and caravan site, BnBs and several equestrian yards (among other businesses), the PC is working with BBC to look to promote the windmill and encourage tourism to the local area, the NDP looks to support this aim	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202r	Park Road	It would not be difficult to construct a policy which was locally relevant. For example the policy could take into account that the village is on well used D of E, scouting, and walking routes, with opportunities for equestrian facilities to take advantage of the bridleways in the village which other villages do not have this network. The SNP could identify specific policies to support the development in this village to leverage these advantages for tourism, business, employment.	None	Please see response comment #202q	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202s	Park Road	The preamble to BE01 references NPPF Para 83. However BE01 is more restrictive than NPPF(2018) which allows development, which has different rules, and is more flexible. For example Farm buildings have to be redundant. What about farm buildings in use having a change of use? Why do they have to be redundant? How will this help farm diversification.	None	The NDP is not looking to be more restrictive than current planning legislation (this will be determined by the LPA prior to Regulation 16). In the example provided exiting agricultural development rights would not be affected	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202t	Park Road	The SNP makes not attempt to reconcile BE01 with the NPPF and explain the justification for its divergence with the NPPF. Effectively the SNP have disregarded the NPPF and attempted to write its own more restrictive policy, without any evidence or justification for this departure	None	The NDP is not looking to be more restrictive than current planning legislation (this will be determined by the LPA prior to Regulation 16). Bedford Borough Council as LPA have already reviewed the proposed Policies, all Policies have been written in conjunction with our NDP consultant	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202u	Park Road	NPPF - According to paragraph 83, to promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood planning policies and decisions should enable: • the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings • the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses • sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; This policy does Not comply with BBC 2030 Plan (HELEN NOT STRATEGIC POLICIES?? <sic>)	None	The NDP is not looking to be more restrictive than current planning legislation (this will be determined by the LPA prior to Regulation 16). Bedford Borough Council as LPA have already reviewed the proposed Policies and will determine if they do not align with the current and emerging Local Plans	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202v	Park Road	Bedford Borough 2030 plan is very in favour of rural development:- "It is important that the Parish encourages and supports a thriving local economy in order to enhance and ensure the sustainability of the community. Our policies will support proportionate growth of all types of sustainable business and enterprise in the Parish: rural tourism and leisure facilities that benefit local businesses, residents and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside will be encouraged." Banning all new buildings Stevington will not encourage rural development, and so could not enhance and ensure the sustainability of the community.	None	The NDP does not look to "ban" all new buildings in the Parish, please see the stated Aims within the main document body	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202w	Park Road	The preamble to the policies would appear to support sustainable development "Our policies will support proportionate growth of all types of sustainable business and enterprise in the Parish: rural tourism and leisure facilities that benefit local businesses, residents and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside will be encouraged." The policy is however so restrictive as to effectively rule out most opportunities and so does not support sustainable development.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	202x	Park Road	This is a significant wasted opportunity to create a policy specific to this village which would significantly benefit new and existing business, employment and tourism and the residents of Stevington.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	203	Park Road	BE02 - Does not meet the basic requirements as does not have regard to the NPPF. The Policy is out of date with current Broadband technology and policy and is not deliverable as developers are being asked to deliver a service which is outside their control. Recommendation: Delete or replace with policy 98 wording	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a more detailed response. Bedford Borough Council as LPA have already reviewed the proposed Policies and will determine if they do not align with the current and emerging Local Plans	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	204a	Park Road	It is unclear what the term 'incorporate ...functionality' means	None	Incorporate means "include"	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	204b	Park Road	Neither is it clear what 'impact negatively' means or how this could be judged as there is no recognised standard or functionality to assess this and providers will not guarantee speeds or functionality in any case	None	An example of a negative impact maybe the reduction of service or connection speeds of other users	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	204c	Park Road	The policy is not local in any way. It does not recognise the specific needs of Stevington or even a rural area. It could for example have made specific provision for alternative methods of providing internet connectivity for the rural area, such as that provided by Bigblu and Ruralinternet. It makes not reference to the fact that fibre to the cabinet is not available to all areas of Stevington yet	None	The Policy is designed to ensure that all new dwellings have access to high speed internet as standard, the option is then available as to the level of service the occupier chooses to purchase. It should be noted that a NDP is not designed to try to remedy current service deliquences but ensure new development doesn't incur the same restrictions	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	204d	Park Road	The NPPF policy on Broadband is not even referenced. The NPPF policy supports the provision of infrastructure to support fibre to the premises when made available by suppliers, which is much more ambitious than the SNP policy	None	The NDP is not proposing to impose higher standards of broadband connectivity on developers than current NPPF requirements	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	204e	Park Road	The Policy is not deliverable as developers cannot guarantee the impact of the service provider chosen by the home owner on speeds for other users, and will not guarantee availability for small housing developments. This policy in effect will be merely to be another block to development – any development in Stevington not served by Fibre to the cabinet (which is outside the control of the developer) will be barred by this policy	None	There is no requirement stated within the Policy for developers to provide a fibre connection either to cabinet or to home	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11 & Correspondent #12	204f	Park Road	Does not meet the basic requirements as does not have regard to the NPPF. The Policy is out of date with current Broadband technology and policy and is not deliverable as developers are being asked to deliver a service which is outside their control. The policy could be re-written to agree with BBC 2030 Broadband policy 98 or be deleted as it is not necessary and is a potential barrier to development.	None	A NDP is designed to work in conjunction with a Local Plan not to repeat it. When made LP 2030 Policy 98 will be used to determine planning applications in the Parish alongside the NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondents #7	205	West End	There have been no sites allocated to allow the growth of business and tourism nor are there any sites suggested for future housing needs, especially affordable housing	None	Please see response comment #59	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondents #7	206	West End	The plan was misleadingly written to suggest these are public places and residents have been misinformed that these sites will go ahead and become set in stone as local green spaces which were described as 'public'. The plan claimed many times that the suggested local green spaces had already been approved by the Borough Council when this was totally untrue, actually many of these sites had been previously rejected by the Borough Council	None	At no point anywhere in the Plan document is it stated that Bedford Borough Council have 'approved' any of the proposed LGS sites we are therefore unable to respond further to this statement due to its inaccuracy in fact	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondents #7	207	West End	The local green spaces proposed are not spread in relevant areas of the village which need protection (eg around the windmill) and none of these sites have public access. Many sites are in people's gardens and despite the national guidelines which say local green spaces may not be situated where a business is run from, many of your suggested local green spaces are directly on top of business premises so they should have never been suggested there. How does this support the growth of local businesses as claimed by your contradictory waffle in the Neighbourhood Plan where it claims to encourage growth of business and tourism	None	The section on Local Green Spaces has been reviewed based on feedback from respondents, as far as we are aware these do not conflict with known businesses	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Correspondents #7	208	West End	Despite the national planning policy framework not a single landowner of any of these proposed local green spaces has been consulted before you put forward their land as a local green space	Edit	LGS section has been revised after further advice received from UVE & other post inspection NDP groups	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondents #7	209	West End	The parish council did not give the public access to all of the relevant documents supporting this plan during the consultation period (perhaps to hide the contradicting information in the documents of the Borough Council from whom they claimed to have support) and this has hindered the involvement of residents. Since the parish council clearly does not want to spend any more time or effort on this plan I suggest it is thrown out altogether	None	The professional advice that we have received is that we have met all of our obligations under Regulation 14, the consultation period was extended primarily to ensure all interested parties had access to any supporting relevant documentation. The fact that the Plan has been revised and a second consultation period has been triggered should give a good indication as to how much the PC supports the NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #3	210	Bedford	This is an objection to HO2 and a suggested site along Park Lane. The need for retirement housing is understated and this is a site which could provide retirement or open market housing as well as other community benefits as allotments, cafe and or a meeting area	None	Please see response comment #59	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	211	Park Road	Despite the NPPF and the questionnaire responses, and other comments in the SNP, the actual proposed policy is unreasonably restrictive in seeking to restrict development to existing buildings and businesses.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	211a	Park Road	There is a presumption in national policy of sustainable development. NPPF specifically supports 'well designed new buildings'. The proposed SNP policy is therefore contrary to the NPPF.	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided so unable to provide a response	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	211b	Park Road	Bedford Borough policies support rural development eg Policy E22 states that "proposals for horse related, non-residential, development will be permitted where there would be no adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside..." Bedford Borough Council Allocations and Designations 2013 states 5.2 Some types of development such as low key countryside recreation uses may need to be in rural areas. Policy 76 in the Bedford Borough Council 2030 plan permits new employment development in the countryside and specifically refers to new buildings, which are permitted if there are no suitable existing buildings. Policy 79 Improvement and provision of new visitor accommodation – planning permission will be granted for new builds subject to certain conditions e.g. if they are related to a defined SPA, small settlements or the built form of other settlements The SNP policy is therefore inconsistent with the Local as well as National Policy framework	None	The NDP is not looking to be more restrictive than current planning legislation (this will be determined by the LPA prior to Regulation 16). Bedford Borough Council as LPA have already reviewed the proposed Policies and will determine if they do not align with the current and emerging Local Plans	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	211c	Park Road	It must be revised to bring it in line or the SNP will be found on Examination to have not met the basic conditions	None	BBC will not allow the Plan to progress to Regulation 16 if they don't agree that it meets the basic conditions, the Inspector will then confirm the same	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	211d	Park Road	Some appropriate development simply cannot be accommodated in existing buildings as the buildings are not available, unsuitable, inappropriately sited, and using them for the new purpose would be wasteful. For example including a camping shower block, or a number of stables in a large existing barn; a camp site entrance cabin in a building significantly distant from the site entrance. A tool shed for allotments not near the allotments. A cattle or lambing shed where none currently exists	None	Opinion statement only - no evidence for the comment is provided to demonstrate that all existing buildings within the Parish have been reviewed and confirmed as unsuitable for any future use though it is worth noting that many of the cited examples already have development exemptions under the current planning process	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	212	Park Road	We would like the Parish Council to include in the SNP proposals consideration of developments for the following - many of which were specifically suggested in the village questionnaire comments on needs: • Camping and or caravan and or glamping site • Equestrian centre and or livery yard and or equestrian breeding and or equestrian training facility and or equestrian school • Farm / other shop / outside catering facility / tea room • Surgery / post office • Rural offices • Light industrial units • Commercial forest/play/activity/recreational centre • Allotments and associated business • Intensive farming including e.g. glasshouses and polytunnels • Animal units – farm animals or other animals e.g. kennels, cattery • Green energy production e.g. wind turbine, solar panel, bio energy • Green burial site • Youth club / holiday club • Old age people and or youth club • Swimming pool • Nursery / day care / residential care home/sheltered housing community	None	Stevington already has examples of many of the types of business listed i.e. camping site, equestrian centres/livery yards, community shop, rural offices, light industrial units, farming etc. Most commercial enterprises require significant footfall to make them financially viable hence the village has lost services such as the shop, bakery, Post Office, nursery, school in the past. This is not a unique problem to Stevington but is an issue with the majority of small rural villages in the UK. BBC for example estimate a need of 500 houses to support a new lower school so the NDP has to be cognizant in which types of business can be realistically encouraged to the Parish.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11	212a	Park Road	We will support consideration of any sites in or near Stevington for the above needs. We specifically ask that all the land owned by The Barrett Family is included as potential sites for Business Employment and Tourism development in the SNP. This land includes Maythorn Farm, 88 Park Farm, the 25 acre field including and extending to the rear of Site N on Park Road, and the field to the rear of Maythorn Farm.  We have no concrete plans as yet. However we feel that the SNP has 'forced our hand' and we must at this stage register interest in development, including new buildings, related to business employment and tourism.	None	Please see response comment #59 It would be inappropriate to consider single ownership sites only, any call for sites will always be open to all landowners	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task	
Correspondent #11		213	Park Road	The SNP and the questionnaire identified significant housing need	None	The NDP is looking to support development above and beyond the Parish targets set within the current and emerging Local Plans	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11		213a	Park Road	The Parish did not have a call for sites In the call for sites in 2017 carried out by Bedford Borough Council no sites were offered within the SPA No sites inside or outside the SPA were actually proposed for development by the SNP	None	Opinion statements only - no response required	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11		213b	Park Road	It is quite likely that no one in the SPA will be willing or able to put forward sites suitable to meet the identified housing need identified in the SNP. The policy is therefore not deliverable which is contrary to the requirement of the legislation relating to Neighbourhood Plans	None	The independent review by Urban Vision Enterprises details how new development can be supported within the village	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11		213c	Park Road	Housing outside the SPA is likely to be necessary if the village is to meet the recognised housing need	None	The independent review by Urban Vision Enterprises details how new development can be supported within the village	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11		213d	Park Road	The purpose a neighbourhood plan is to direct development, not prevent it. The NPPF states that there is an over arching presumption in favour of sustainable development if a housing need has been identified. If this SNP does not have a deliverable policy relating to development outside the SPA and the national and local policies are met e.g. relating to social housing all sites are 'fair game' to developers and the village will have limited influence over the scale and nature of the development – see NPPF para 14	None	The independent review by Urban Vision Enterprises details how new development can be supported within the village	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11		213e	Park Road	Half of respondents (51.2 %) to the village questionnaire agreeing that "Village Boundaries - New dwellings outside the SPA may be considered providing they are justified on sustainability grounds (i.e. self-sufficient & not requiring main services)" This is not reflected in the proposed policy. Similarly even more (57.7%) agreed that "Village Boundaries - New dwellings outside the SPA may be considered providing they provide a community facility or recreation route (e.g. footpath or bridleway)"	None	The questionnaire was designed to seek levels support for a variety of Policy options that would then indicate the levels of support for the Policy options, those Policies with the clearest support where then taken forward to the NDP	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #11		214	Park Road	We would like to propose that the SNP be revised to include consideration of specific sites outside the SPA which should be evaluated against the stated local need for housing. Specifically all the land in the ownership of Mr and Mrs Barrett be included in the SNP for consideration for housing development to meet locally identified needs. Furthermore we suggest that it is appropriate to include in the SNP the reinstating sites of former housing in the village for example in the 'Ends'	None	Please see response comment #59 It would be inappropriate to consider single ownership sites only, any call for sites will always be open to all landowners	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13		215	West End	I suspect that the plan's details were devised by a very few people, and the person with the best planning knowledge left the group a year ago. Then the bases for the Plan have been moved by the new NPPF, and the Borough's varying new Plans first to 2035 and then to 2030.	None	The NPWG has consisted of a minimum of six people at all times during the plan creation process professional advice has been sought at key stages and emerging policies discussed with the LPA. The Plan has been reviewed and rewritten several times against Local Plans 2032, 2035 and the emerging 2030 version as well as the changes to NPPF 2018 and 2019, each revision has been reviewed by our planning consultant. The NPWG contained at least two PC members up until August 2017 when the plan passed to the PC, the NPWG continues in an advisory capacity to the PC who have always retained ownership of the plan	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13		216	West End	If the Plan is silent about any aspect of planning, then the Local Policy form Bedford Borough will prevail. Has this been considered?	None	The NDP is designed to compliment the current and emerging Local Plans, as part of the plan creation process the LP policies are identified and the NDP looks to expand on these for the specifics relating to the village and its setting	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13		217	West End	The NPPF has an overarching presumption that development will be permitted unless there are specific circumstances not to do so in certain areas, of for specific reasons. This SNP has not addressed the need for specific local evidence to explain why there should be further restrictions to development, instead it is almost crushing the opportunities for any development in the village. This is not therefore a sustainable position. We have to face up to development in the near future.	None	The NDP balances positive planning for future development in the village against the sustainability of that development given the challenges faced by rural communities in terms of service provision, infrastructure etc. The NDP is aligned to the current and emerging LP in this respect.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13		218	West End	I don't believe that the SNP has designated the Local Green Spaces to be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.	None	Opinion statement only	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13		219	West End	In parts it states that planning will be approved in the SPA if the policies are upheld, but there may have to be some development of farm buildings. Yet there are no plans to show where these would be considered. There were a few specific suggestions in the independent Capacity Report, form UVE but these have not been included.	None	The purpose of the Policies with the NDP are to enable the development opportunities in UVE's capacity report, this will apply equally to all qualifying sites within the Parish hence there is no need to list them individually within the Plan document	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	220	West End	The Housing policies do not say in which order they will be up held, ie only within the SPA H01 rather than farm buildings H03. While the preamble suggests 11-15 houses, with no planning evidence for this number, although you advisors UVE say it is an acceptable figure, but I could find no evidence. These figures are not contained within the actual housing policies. These makes the plan confusing and unclear.	None	Please see response comment #192 All policies in the plan would be considered, they are not designed to be sequential. The NDP details how the PC will monitor delivery of the Plan.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	221	West End	To be affordable to first time buyers they would have to be cheaper than smaller houses recently sold in the Village. But unless some small areas, or sites for Self-Build projects as detailed in the NPPF are permitted then no one will want to develop the possible sites, as they will not be commercial. So, does the PC intend that Charitable or Housing Associations develop the houses and retain ownership of them?	None	The Plan seeks to encourage development of smaller housing through policy direction on small scale cluster developments, affordable housing schemes already have exemptions designed to enable their development as needed	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	222	West End	On a matter of management of this document and its evolution, the SNPWG was set up to develop the Plan for the Parish Council. Hopefully that group always included some Parish Councillors and was chaired by a Parish Councillor. Only by asking did I discover that the SNPWG no longer met separately after the meeting of Aug 2017, (last minutes on the website). However, it is still referred to in the minutes of the Parish Council in Dec 2017, July 2018. In which case where are the minutes of its later meetings? Where is the formal policy of the creation of this committee and its terms of reference, and of its being wound up?	None	Please see response comment #215 with respect to the workings of the NPWG. It was created as a sub-committee of SPC in January 2015 with Terms of Reference. The NPWG continues to support the PC in an advisory capacity; hence it is still referenced by the PC. All minutes are included with the SPC meetings from August 2017 onwards, and are available on the PC website	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	223	West End	On a matter of integrity of this Plan - There is no section covering how any conflict of interest and personal feeling is dealt with in firstly creating this plan and secondly with deciding planning consent or objection to future plans. Who will lead on these and how will the process be manager? While I trust that the PC has a policy for disclosure of conflict of interest, I do not see any evidence of this being included in the planning and writing of this document. Surely in a village of such a small population (SNP suggests population of approximately 580) this aspect is crucial, the PC does not want to be accused of being a closed shop it should demonstrate how it is detached in its decision making and transparency in its workings, thus avoiding conflicts of interest, particularly in how the plan was developed and written. Who did propose these plans, were they covered by the PC's conflict of interest policy. Is there any room to be accused of Nim2byism <sic>?	None	The NDP is an evidence-based document. All policies have been created only where it has been demonstrated that they have support of the community. Any conflict of interest would have been declared before each WG meeting. Stevington Parish Council does not have the authority to provide planning consent; support or objection to any application would follow the stated Planning Process Policy. The Plan creation processed is detailed within the NDP document under the 'Community and Stakeholder Engagement' section.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	224	West End	On a matter of poor approach to this very serious and critical document - In recent correspondence and in PC minutes the P Councillors have admitted that those key in the development of the policy were hard pressed to deliver this plan, and recently that as Amateurs with busy jobs they cannot provide the time needed to do all the work necessary to provide certain documents, or maintain the website where most but not all of the documents referred to in the SNP are available. It was even suggested that the web site did not have the band width necessary to hold all the documents. Well why not when the PC increased its annual precept, no doubt to specifically to pay for the Neighbourhood plan? Due to these issues should the PC reflect on whether they should pursue this NP and whether they have the knowledge and professionalism needed to carry out the necessary research and writing and then ongoing work to maintain this plan into the future. There will now be a need for it to be reviewed every 2 years. Is the PC really going to be able to provide this?	None	National Government actively encourages the delivery of NDP's by local people for and on behalf of their communities, utilising local knowledge to deliver a more specialised plan than say a local LPA would be expected to be able to achieve. By this aim alone it is fair to assume most working groups will be made up of 'amateur' volunteers rather than professional planners. Unless they are very lucky indeed, most NDP groups will not have direct access to planning expertise, however, SPC has always mitigated this potential issue by supporting and fully funding access to a qualified planning consultant at each key stage of the development of the plan. The website has been hosted and provided by a volunteer within the village, your expectations as to its performance would seem to be somewhat disproportionate for a small village with less than 600 residents. SPC are confident that the website meets Regulation 14 requirements. SPC are committed to reviewing and maintaining the plan as detailed in the governance section of the document, this will be fully budgeted to include costs for any professional advice	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	225	West End	The SNP is to last from 2018 to 2035 yet with no actual statistical evidence of new home number to 2035, and it won't be passed until late 2019 at latest. By rushing this through, after some years of deliberation, is it really appropriate?	None	Please see the section 'Why the Neighbourhood Plan is important' as to the rationale behind the 2035 end date	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	226	West End	In your Aims there is no definition of "Stevington's distinctiveness and valued features" If you are trying to be sensitive to these, then surely it is essential to know what they are. The primary planning aims suggested that have the strongest support include:- "ensure all generations have easy access to community facilities and green open spaces encouraging participation in leisure and recreation activities by protecting and enhancing local amenities ". This surely implies that Green Open Spaces are nominated for use, and will have Public access. Do you really mean Local Green Spaces? Yet virtually all those identified are privately owned, they have NO PUBLIC ACCESS and many are used for business including agriculture. But what do you mean here, as you use green space, green open spaces and on pg 13 local green spaces, do these all refer to the same thing? If not then they need better description, otherwise they need the same words, this is misleading.	None	No, the use of the words 'green open spaces' rather than 'local green spaces' is deliberate differentiator between the two, LGS has its own specific NPPF designation and criteria	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

**Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019**

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	227	West End	This has neglected to make any comment concerning how this NP will develop businesses and employment and tourism. The strategy details the 3 overarching objectives within the NPPF- Economic, social and environment objective. The first is to have an economic objective, to promote business, create a strong, responsive and competitive economy, to support growth, innovation and improved productivity. Yet the first paragraph after the three overarching objectives, talks about encouraging positive co-operation, but never mentions businesses, employment or the local economy, it only refers to residents, landowners and developers. Here you do not limit the housing development as you do in Policy HO2. Positive co-operation clearly does not mean specific consultation, as required by Govt Guidance to NPPF, as none of the owners of designated areas have been spoke to by the PC or the SNPWG	None	Please see response comment #185 The community engagement events and the recent consultation phase were all designed to provide engagement with businesses and residents and to seek opinion from each. All feedback has been reviewed and used as the basis for the proposed Policies	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	228	West End	Brown field sites are mentioned here, saying that “support will also be given to those proposals on existing brown field sites, or revitalise derelict or redundant buildings. But in the housing and business development policies only redundant agricultural and commercial building will be considered. Why have you not got a list of the recognised Brown Sites, or derelict buildings. A brown site would be just as suitable, for such conversions. Again, this is confusing, why mention them if they are not in later policies. The NPPF now specifically encourages the use of Brown Field sites for development and encourages local authorities to keep a list of them.	None	As the NPPF and Local Plan already encourages the re-use of brown field sites it was not felt that a further local NDP policy was required	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	229	West End	There is no plan showing any possible sites for development, nor is there any list even though some sites outside the SPA were tabled in the independent capacity review. There is Government guidance for the SNP to disclose identified sites, which should be discussed with landowners. Neither of these have been done.	None	Identification of potential development sites is an option for a NDP, it is not a requirement. In developing the plan a capacity report was commissioned to verify that the development target was realistic and this was confirmed by UVE.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	230	West End	SNP also stated important green spaces are to be protected and green wildlife corridors are to be promoted and supported. (No specific wildlife corridors have been identified, but some Green Spaces are recommended on the basis of protecting these corridors, but without evidence.) The rural characteristic of most of the parish land lends itself quite naturally to an amazing range of wildlife, seen on a daily basis by residents all over the parish. So why no corridors identified, and why not use stepping stone corridors as detailed in the NPPF, around all of the village including better cross routes through the SPA.	None	As part of the evidencing phase for the original LGS submissions the SPC engaged with the village Natural History group to help identify sites of particular interest for wildlife and habitats etc.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	231	West End	What type of recreational facilities for a healthier lifestyle are going to be encouraged. The SNP wants to create all these open local Green Spaces yet you claim you want new business and or recreational activities, so how can these be built if you close down so many sites, and will not allow developments. This is typical or the contradictory messages in this report that you want things but don't want any development. You are too silent on what and how and where you would like recreational facilities.	None	The NDP is not attempting to be restrictive by providing a definitive list of those facilities that would be supported, rather it would aim to encourage any appropriate proposal that improves the quality of recreational facilities	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	232	West End	The picture used on page 9 where the key aims are mentioned is of a farm view on FP6, looking north out of the parish! (not a view from a Green Open Space). I know you did not have the owners permission to use this photograph.	None	All images are used for illustration purposes only and are reproduced by permission of the photographer. We are not aware of any legislation that copyrights views across landholdings	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	233	West End	27% are retirement pensioners – not what the census says, 27% are 65 or older, but some of these still work and are not necessarily pensioners!	Edit	<b>Update to the plan narrative to rephrase to 'of pensionable age'</b>	<b>Plan revised - v 4.0</b>	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	233a	West End	Travel to work on public transport should include train, so 7.5% not 1%! Population para 4, last line “suggests the over-75s will form 13% of the village population’, well it is already 14%, surely it is therefore likely to be higher! So this is more evidence of the need for bungalows for elderly people. Perhaps you should go as far to suggest a development of sheltered retirement homes. So again, evidence is poor and inaccurate.	None	Access to the train station is not reasonably possible from Stevington without use of either public transport or by car, so the statistic most likely represents the first mode of transport used not all forms of transport Policies have already been detailed to include provision for an increasingly older population profile	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	234	West End	Parish Amenities, are described as “very limited amenities remaining in the Village”, yet no specific new ones are identified, or really given any encouragement. This would be a worthwhile planning policy and in line with the NPPF. A plan could encourage other community facilities, eg for sports, for public parking, for artisan workshops, a tent only camping site, a rural activities area, eg tree climbing, Kayaking, tree planting, even a more unusual idea of a green burial site, or a site for an annual music festival.	None	The NDP identifies aspirational items and looks to encourage new business opportunities through its Business and Employment policies.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	234a	West End	The Conservation area was created in 1971, but the Borough did not create a plan for it, which it should have done. So, why not put together more guidance for it in this document, eg should there be separate Conservation Area Planning application, it seems that sometimes there is and sometimes there isn't. Should there be more detail on what is expected for infill, extensions and alterations in this area	None	The NDP does not look to supersede or conflict current or future policies within the Local Plan else it risks failing the basic conditions. The policies relating to CA were reviewed as part of the plan creation process and our policies are cognizant and supportive of the designation	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	234b	West End	Does your planning apply equally to all houses or just to the Listed Buildings	None	All policies apply to all development within the Parish	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	234c	West End	Should there also be a Conservation area around the Windmill as this is probably the most frequently used landmark and symbol for the Village	None	Plan Policy DH03 is designed to support protection for the windmill and its setting	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	235	West End	Pg 20, The SNP does not appear to know where The Ouse Valley Way goes within the parish - it starts at the Village cross, and does not visit the Church!!! It does not meet the river until the other side of Bromham, after access to Bromham from the Stevington Country Walk. The final paragraph on the page is misleading.	None	The narrative on p20 does not claim that the OVW passes the church, it states it 'runs close to' given the church is highlighted as a place of interest on the OVW map of the walk it doesn't seem too erroneous to include a reference to it in supporting narrative	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	236	West End	While the PC and the SNPWG did call public consultation meetings, there have been NO consultation with the owners of land or building specifically identified in one or other of the sections in this proposed SNP. I have reliably been informed that if to consultation, then the plan is floored. I have spoken widely to people in the village and those who live outside that confirm this situation. Further more Government guidance requires Consultation with neighbouring parishes, to ensure some cohesion within the Local Authority area. What evidence is there of this being undertaken and what were the findings if this consultation?	None	The community engagement activities have been fully documented within the 'Community and Stakeholder Engagement' section of the Plan, these activities have extended across a number of years and has included invitations and information drops to all residents and businesses within the village. The NDP does not look to identify specific development sites so consultation with specific landowners is not relevant for this reason All national and local bodies have been contacted as part of the consultation phase and this has included all adjacent Parish Councils	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	236a	West End	Housing and Growth page 34; In the Other Rationale Penultimate paragraph, the SNP refers to being prepared to consider developments with a maximum of 5 houses. Once again, the Housing Policies do not reflect this, so there are inconsistencies which lead to confusion as to what is permitted	Edit	Update to the plan narrative to clarify Policy wording	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	236b	West End	West End is Pg 49 Local Environment, Para I there is also large areas on Boulder Clay on the higher ground, eg West End.	None	Opinion statement only	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	237	West End	While I acknowledge and appreciate the extension to the Public Consultation time, it was a hard battle to establish further disclosure and a public extension. There are still items not disclosed, such as the Borough's response to your submission of Local Green Spaces. I suspect there are others, but time has not allowed me to do a full assessment. I should also point out that it was only towards the end of the original consultation that you actually re-assessed the website pages of documents and links. They should have been done far earlier. In the interest of fairness I feel that the public should know this. There is also the lack of disclosure to people who own land in Stevington, but who do not live here, I know that they did not know of this consultation period for the SNP, or its extension. What evidence have you that you tried realistically to ensure they were also notified?	None	Please see response comment #68 We received only two requests to extend the consultation period, from yourself and Mrs Barrett (who you have already acknowledged are working together on your responses) representing a very small minority of the village population. In the interests of fairness and transparency this was agreed to, and an extension period (longer than requested) was widely publicised within the village and on the website. The professional advice we received was that we had already met the pre-submission requirements for Regulation 14 within the original period, however the PC recognises that as a close-knit community we should be as flexible as possible.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	237a	West End	What evidence have you that you tried realistically to ensure they were also notified?	None	Please see the section 'Community Engagement' within the ND Plan, this details all of the various engagement activities	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	238	West End	Why have you surrounded the North west of the Village and West End with significant proposals for Local Green Spaces? Park End and Church End are also surrounded. Is this blanketing the whole area, which is expressly not what is intended in the NPPF. Why are there no suggested Local Green Spaces in Duck End and further along the road to the A428? Has Duck End been left for future development. If so why, using what rationale?	Edit	The section on Local Green Spaces has been reviewed based on feedback from respondents and the number submitted has been reduced to reflect comments received	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	239	West End	Why have you suggested uniformity with the Bourgh's Plan. They have specifically rejected all but one of the Open Green Spaces proposed by the SNP, both in their specific response to the PCs original submission and in their Local plan to 2030	None	Please see response comment #68	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	239a	West End	Incidentally, when the asked for disclosure of the Borough's response to the Open Green Spaces, it was not provided. Again, this is not full disclosure nor transparency. Clearly you did not want this information to be available to people reviewing the SNP, as your plans could have been undermined and objected to, by more people. The Advisors to the PC have said that you risk the Examiner removing some of the Local Green Spaces (as per your SNPWG and PC minutes). You also acknowledged this and the Borough's refusal, but instead of removing some you have tried to justify your original proposal. Is this the right approach?	None	Please see response comment #68, the NDP is a separate Planning document and unrelated to the original (old) Local Plan and is available in the public domain	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	240	West End	Stevington does not yet have "an extensive network of high quality and accessible public green spaces". The vast majority of these proposed local green spaces are NOT PUBLIC, but on private land where there is NO public access. The Parish have taken a strange approach to create a vast network, even though they already know that the Borough does not agree with the Parish's view	None	Please see response comment #68, although an unrelated submission the LPA 'view' was strongly challenged at the time not just by SPC	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	240a	West End	The Borough and NPPF suggest that these Green Spaces, now called Local Green Space, should be to protect the edges of the SPA. Many are some distance even more than half a mile from the SPA. The attempt at justifying these falls short, the reasons for justifying them were not approved by the Borough, based on the Borough's interpretation of the NPPF criteria. So the reference in para 2 of the SNP to Bedford Borough's provision and public access promoting health seems meaningless	None	The NPPF does not require LGS's to be close to a SPA, in fact the term SPA comes from the Local Plan and not the NPPF so would not be referenced there	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	240b	West End	The Parish's criteria do not meet their own, the Borough's or the NPPF. They have tried to place the spaces around some of the more sparsely populated areas of the Parish, not always around the fringes of the SPA. They even include private gardens, private houses and farm yards	None	Please see response comment #68	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	240e	West End	. Is it a coincidence that some of them are on areas which were put forward in the call for development sites from the Borough?	None	LGS site appraisal was not connected to LP BBC call for sites	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	241	West End	The parish has chosen not to extend the SPA, to include the ends of the village, even though the Conservation area does include Church End. But I have to ask the question - Is West End surrounded with Local Green Spaces, so that if the interpretation of a Small Settlement which needs its own SPA is reduced and so covers West End, then the LGSs prevent development. The SNP has not followed the Borough definition of 30 or more dwellings being a Small Settlement, although West End is almost that large, and the NP uses the phrase Small Settlement, but does not define it. So, to protect the planned green spaced around more rural areas, where development is already prevented as they do not qualify because they are both rural and outside the SPA, is at best over-kill, but perhaps it is a NIMBY approach.	None	The designation of the SPA area is methodology defined by BBC and the NDP does not look to challenge that process. The capacity report supports the development target for the village so an expansion of the current SPA was not required at this time. The expansion of the current SPA to to include West End was not an issue that was highlighted as a priority based on feedback from the community engagement events.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	242	West End	In the Key Issues Identified, the plan states at the 4th bullet point that there are "natural corridors". In private ownership they are not necessary available for recreational purposes. There are no plans that stand up to any existing or prosed policies of the Borough or the Village which will permit the development of these rural corridors and spaces, so what is the PC trying to protect by their approach.	None	Natural corridors are also designed to support the movement of wildlife between different sites, they don't have to be just for recreational purposes, our policies are designed to help support the retention of these	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	243	West End	It is also evident that there has not been a uniform approach. There are fields nearer to the SP and others around some ends that have not been proposed for Green Open Spaces, why not? They are equally covered by the generalist terms used to justify the others. Yet for some reason are not seen as a threat. There is no evidence readily available as to how the sites were chosen, or indeed whether others were not taken up. The areas identified in Church End are in the vicinity of the SPA, so too are the ones along Silver Street, but Duck End has no suggested Green Spaces, yet Park End and West End have an inordinate number each. Why is this? What are the motives? Is there a conflict of interest or lack of impartiality on the part of the committee drawing up this NP, or even among the Parish Council. Good practice in Borough and National Guidance suggests that landowners of any proposed Local Green Spaces should be consulted. Of all those I have spoken to, none of them have been consulted by the PC or their representatives. This also applies to proposed development sites. Another very local NP has consulted with landowners of all types of designated and proposed development sites and had its own call for sites. By not talking to landowners the SNP has frequently inaccurately described prospective sites. Knowing that this has not been done openly and in best practice, one has to wonder what else is inaccurate and or wrong. The SNP says they had talked to landowners. But this was only with those who turned up at the public consultations, and then not specifically about their specific land proposed for Local Green Spaces.	Edit	The approach to the selection of LGS is documented within the NDP, the PC have reviewed the LGS submission based on feedback from the consultation phase and reduced the number of sites accordingly. There has been no call for sites as the Plan development target can be achieved without the need for sites to be determined (please see UVE Capacity Report) so consultation with landowners over specific sites is not necessary though obviously they have been engaged throughout the Plan creation process.	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	244	West End	Objection to Local Green Spaces in West End: Site T FROST FIELD Site U - Baxter's Lane Site V North west end of Green Close <Site> X Sutches <Site> Y East of FP6 including Meeting Piece So none of the evidence provided to support this proposed site can stand up to scrutiny. Interestingly the cottage that backs onto this strip of land is lived in by a Parish Councillor. This is proposal is totally spurious. This was over egged in the application for sites, and is beyond reason. The Borough Council did not approve this designation, even though previously it was shown as 2 separate areas. It is not appropriate for a LGS and the proposal should be dropped. While I do not feel the need to personally refer to all the proposed sites, I think there are problems with the vast majority of them. Why does a village of 580 people and about 250 houses need to have almost 30 Local Green Spaces? In the papers submitted by Stevington to the Borough Council for their LGSs, the criteria used was just endlessly repeated, and generally no specifics were added. WHY are there so may protected spaces? We can't really develop the countryside except in very specific areas, and mostly in the SPA, so why try to blanketly tie up the agricultural fields with generalities and NIMBY statements?	Edit	The section on Local Green Spaces has been reviewed based on feedback from respondents and the number submitted has been reduced to reflect comments received Interestingly the LGS section of the Plan was authored many months before the Parish Councillor implied by you comment joined the PC so we are unsure what relevance or merit this comment has?	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	245	West End	Having asked at consultations about creating an SPA for West End, nothing has been said about this. Was it considered? The Borough recognise small settlements as having 30 houses, which would require an SPA. There is a building in West End which has permission of unlimited time scale for development as a House. This has not been considered in the number of possible dwellings. There are 23 dwellings in West End. If there were 2 sites in West End of Redundant Agricultural buildings, following your policy H03, both of which sought permission for 4 dwellings, would one or other be refused on the grounds that you do not want to create a new SPA in West End? Clarity of Interpretation of the Polies is urgently needed. Again to help with future requests you need to make a bench mark now of the Properties in the Village, and their possible conversions so everyone knows the starting situation.	None	The expansion of the current SPA to to include West End was not an issue that was highlighted as a priority based on feedback from the community engagement events. SPA designation, or not, would be a decision made by BBC under Local Plan Policy	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #12 & Correspondent #13	246	West End	Repeats are common, population on pgs 14 and 16, references to Paula Radcliffe Sports Centre; pg 20 Natural Environment 2nd paragraph first line typo "is has"; pg21 Limestone Valleys, bullet 3, "has" should be "have"; Pg 23, Community & Stakeholder Engagement, Para 2 second line does not make sense, "in our order for" should this be "in our opinion"?	Edit	Review and edit as suggested	Plan revised - v 4.0	Low	Completed
Correspondent #9	247	Pavenham	You cannot claim to have consulted with all parties concerned when you have not even had the common decency to make contact with effective parties outside of the Parish. At no time has any contact been made with Thomas Beazley and Sons, therefore you cannot claim to have carried out the required consultation	None	Consultation publicity was delivered to all properties and businesses with premises within the Parish and advertised widely including copies sent to Pavenham Parish Council for their review and comment. We apologise if this didn't reach you directly as a landlord in the village though we believe this should have reached you individually via your Parish Clerk. We obviously acknowledge the point made.	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #9	248	Pavenham	Neighbourhood plans are designed to help identify sites within a settlement that are suitable for development, if development is something the community support and then to facilitate the selected sites for sustainable development	None	Agreed, though there is no requirement currently for a NDP to identify specific development sites. The UVE Capacity Report confirms that the NDP development target is achievable within the current parameters of the plan (i.e. SPA and conversion capacity).	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Correspondent #9	249	Pavenham	I am pleased that the plan actively encourages local employment, this is clearly very environmentally sustainable and brings daytime life and vitality into any rural community, something that is clearly lacking in most.We have strived hard to maintain Park Farm as an employment centre, it is incorrect to describe them as only storage as currently there are two very active businesses operating from the site.But it should also be noted and is omitted from your report that permission was granted for the conversion of the originally dairy buildings into a domestic residence when it was proving exceptionally difficult to find a suitable tenant for them as offices after Warmington's take over	Edit	UVE Capacity Report describes Park Farm as "storage and <i>small business premises</i> " - updated detail on conversion permission to the evidence base	Plan revised - v 4.0		Completed
Correspondent #9	250	Pavenham	Your green spaces section is fundamentally flawed and in my opinion totally beyond the remit of a local plan and is certainly the most positive way to alienate local landowners in the process. Obviously my knowledge of Stevington is limited to the area we maintain and it's near surroundings but is gained from a long association with the Parish and spending a considerable amount of time speaking with many of its long since departed village elders <specifically> Site M the Stevington Belt and associated Parkland Site N	Edit	The section on Local Green Spaces has been reviewed based on feedback from respondents and the number submitted has been reduced to reflect comments received	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed
Gladman Developments Ltd	251	Congleton, Cheshire	Policy H1 states that development will only be considered for approval if it is located within the settlement Policy Area of Stevington village and meet the criteria listed under this policy. Gladman consider that the above policy is onerous in its current form as it does not provide any clarity over what forms of development outside the settlement boundary would be considered acceptable. Accordingly, this approach is inconsistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and will likely lead to inconsistency through the decision-making process. Gladman would be opposed to the use of a Settlement Policy Area if these were to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities from coming forward on the edge of Stevington. As such, the approach is contrary to the positive approach to growth as required by the Framework.	None	The designation of the SPA area is methodology defined by BBC under current Local Plan policy and which is also proposed to continue within the emerging Local Plan 2030 which is at Inspector stage (as at Dec 2019)	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed
Gladman Developments Ltd	252	Congleton, Cheshire	Gladman support the general thrust of Policy HO2 which seeks to ensure an appropriate mix of new housing types and tenures to meet the housing needs of the local community. However, housing mix will inevitably change over a period of time and this policy should seek to secure a greater degree of flexibility going forward given that the evidence is now somewhat dated. As local housing needs can change over time, there is a real risk that this policy will become outdated as new evidence of local need comes to light and the neighbourhood plan should contain suitable measures, so it can positively respond to changes in circumstance which may arise over the plan period. Gladman suggest that a modification to this element of the policy is included which takes account of 'the most up-to-date housing needs evidence available'.	None	The NDP has a specific Governance model designed to review and update the plan every five years if it is deemed to either not be effective or needs of the village change, we believe this to be an appropriate mechanism to ensure that the Plan remains effective	No further action - question or opinion statement only, response has been provided but no update to the Plan document required	Low	Completed

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation comments received June/July 2019

Name		Postcode	Comment	Action	Review Response	Plan Action Required	Consultant Priority	Review Status/Pending Task
Gladman Developments Ltd	253	Congleton, Cheshire	Policy EN01: Natural Environment As submitted, this policy is more restrictive than national policy and guidance regarding biodiversity, as it does not allow for mitigation or compensatory measures to counteract impacts on the natural environment. Gladman suggest amendments are made to the wording of the policy to accord with Paragraph 175 of the Framework which seeks for impacts on biodiversity to be minimised.	Edit	Policy wording updated to reflect comment made	Plan revised - v 4.0	High	Completed
Gladman Developments Ltd	254	Congleton, Cheshire	Designation of LGS should not be used as a mechanism to designate new areas of Green Belt (or similar), as the designation of Green Belt is inherently different and must meet a set of stringent tests for its allocation (§135 to 139 of the Framework). In this regard, none of the evidence used to support Site W: 'Hart Farm Field', Site X: 'Sutch's Field', Site Z: 'Langcroft Furlong' and Site CC: 'Fields to the East of Burridge's Close' merit consideration as an LGS under the criteria. The SNP's reasoning includes such contentions as their location outside the Settlement Policy Area (SPA), purpose as a 'gap', their views and wildlife. They are each extensive tracts of land and, as such, Gladman do not believe that SNP supporting evidence is sufficiently robust to justify the proposed allocation of these sites as LGS, given their lack of particularly special features.	Edit	The section on Local Green Spaces has been reviewed based on feedback from respondents and the number submitted has been reduced to reflect comments received	Plan revised - v 4.0	Medium	Completed