

Schedule of Representations

Version 1.0.2

VERSION CONTROL

CONTENTS

Date	Reason	Who	Version No.
January 2025	Submissions and responses from statutory organisations	SG, SS, PC	1.0.2
January 2025	Submissions and responses from residents	SG, SS, PC	1.0.1
November 2024	Document creation	SG	1.0.0

Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Core Objectives and Policy Maps.....	4
Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan.....	8
Policy GC1 – Design Principles.....	16
Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area.....	20
Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery.....	24
Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146).....	31
Policy GC5 – Local Housing Needs.....	37
Policy GC6 – Settlement Boundary.....	41
Policy GC7 – Protection of Views.....	44
Policy GC8 – Local Green Spaces.....	48
Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces.....	52
Policy GC10 – Biodiversity.....	56
Policy GC11 – Cransley Reservoir.....	60
Policy GC12 – Village Facilities.....	63
Policy GC13 – Supporting the Development of Small Businesses... 	66
Policy GC14 – Home Based Businesses.....	69
Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects... 	72
Policy GC16 – Parking in New Developments.....	79
Comment Cards.....	80
Statutory Representations.....	86

Respondent:	Do you agree?:	Subject: Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Core Objectives and Policy Maps		
		Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
R	YES	Great plan and vision for the future of the village	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	Great work all involved I agree with all the future plans	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	I support the plan in full.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
B	NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	NO	<p>The Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan (GCNP) has taken far too long to reach this consultation stage. This process commenced in 2019 and here we are now nearing the end of 2024. It is unlikely that this GCNP will be endorsed by the NCC until sometime in 2025. Hence this plan only has a lifespan of barely 6 years. More importantly, the purpose of a neighbourhood plan is to give local communities direct power to shape development and growth of their local area. This in turn gives residents an opportunity to produce plans that have real statutory weight in the planning system. In this instance however, the horse has long since bolted.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the following page...</i></p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the following page...</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The Plan once 'made' is a live ongoing planning document that will be used by local planning and the Parish Council. The Parish Council has an obligation to review and update the plan.</p>	None Required

Respondent:	Do you agree?:	Subject: Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Core Objectives and Policy Maps		
		Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
		<p>The Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan was formally adopted on 1 December 2021. Accordingly, the GCNP will have minimal impact on the local community's ability to shape the vision for Great Cransley.</p> <p>Frustratingly, the Site Specific Local Plan (SSLP) was developed and implemented without any direct consultation with local residents. What we have now is a GCNP that simply mirrors the SSLP which in my opinion is wholly unacceptable. The GCNP should have shaped the SSLP, not the other way round. The Parish Council at the time unilaterally decided on its preferred location to site any future development. This was undertaken without any consultation with the residents of the village. Indeed, in order to satisfy its desire to locate future housing needs at its preferred location it had to take the drastic steps of extending the original settlement boundary so as to incorporate the parcel of land North of Loddington Road (RA 146). Extraordinarily, this again was undertaken without any consultation with the residents of Great Cransley.</p>		
O	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	Broadly agree.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Respondent:	Do you agree?:	Subject: Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Core Objectives and Policy Maps		
		Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	In principle	Thank you for your comment and support.	
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	NO	I applaud the effort and work in generating this in depth and informative plan, but cannot agree to it in its entirety due to policy GC4 (Loddington Road Site (RA146)) I believe that Great Cransley should retain its small village status and that additional housing is not necessary. It seems that as villages do or are forced to expand they inevitably lose their unique identities.	Thank you for your comment.	None Required
R	YES	The plan is well set out and sympathetic to trying to keep the village small and quiet which in these recent times is important	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Respondent:	Do you agree?:	Subject: Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Core Objectives and Policy Maps		
		Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
R	YES	Generally Plan & Survey to comprehensive/complicated. Probably binned by 40% of Cransley Residents?? No mention of energy projects ie, communal heating oil purchases/deals with internet provide/survey which houses use wood/coal/oil/electricity etc?? Communal rubbish skip & recycling etc	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	The proposed N Plan is essential in helping to retain the village and parish of Gt Cransley for the future. North Northants Council must be seen to adhere to this plan and not ignore it, supposing that no one would notice. The members of the planning dept must also be made aware and this particularly with new people joining the department.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
R	YES	Very comprehensive no need for additional comment.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	A very good document	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	Anything that has already been granted planning permission is supported. Single dwelling applications are also supported.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
R	YES	Anything that has already been granted planning permission is supported. Single dwelling applications are also supported.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required

Online Representations

<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
		General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
✓		Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document Great work and excellent well thought out plan to protect and enhance the village for generations.	Thank you for your comment.	None Required
	✓	Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document Its a great plan and vision for the future of the village	Thank you for your comment.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document The plan policy map H part 2. I think that 1 & 2 are the wrong way around.	The SG will check Map H part 2 and amend if incorrect, thank you.	Amend Map H Part 2 Actioned
✓		Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
	✓	Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document Allow row of new houses along Church Lane as per Mr Claypole's application. Housing/mini industrial units where old Chicken Farm was as per Mr Perkins. Develop Cransley Reservoir lodges & leisure facilities.	Thank you for your comment.	None Required

		Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
OBJECT		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document</p> <p>I have read both the booklet and the Full Plan and my comments relate to both documents due to the inconsistencies between them. The booklet version bizarrely has no page numbering which makes it difficult when attempting to comment on its contents. Generally, I found the booklet version to be poorly drafted and not possible to fully comprehend without constant cross referencing to the Full Document. I'm sure that most residents will base their decision making on the booklet version without going to the trouble and inconvenience of having to obtain a copy of the Full Document. If this proves to be the case then I'm not convinced that the residents will be fully and reliably informed by merely relying on the booklet version.</p> <p>At paragraph 3.1 of the Full Document and which is replicated in the Booklet version reference is made to the 2017 survey. There is no explanation however to which this survey refers. I have looked through the online documents and cannot find any detail relating to this survey. At the very least I would expect a copy of the original questionnaire and the conclusions drawn from such a survey to have been made available to the residents during this consultation process. Accordingly, in the absence of this information I fail to understand how the Key Issues by theme as referred to at paragraph 3.1 of the Full Document can be relied upon.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the following page...</i></p>	<p>The 3 copies of the full version of the Plan were available at all of the public sessions*, and if residents asked for a printed copy, one would have been delivered to the requester. The SG also made available a copy of all documents via online access for everyone.</p> <p>Members of the SG were also available during the 6 week consultation (outside of the public sessions) to attend any resident's home to help answer questions.</p> <p>The cost of printing 130** copies of each of the documents that make up the plan was outside of the scope of the SG's budget.</p> <p>* public sessions totalled 5 in the 6 weeks consultation period</p> <p>**number of residential properties within the Parish</p>	None Required

		Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
		<p><i>This comment is from the previous page...</i></p> <p>At paragraph 3.2 of the Full Document and under the heading Vision in the Booklet version reference is made to the following "Vision Statement" However, in the Booklet version there is no Vision Statement following the paragraph in question. Are we to assume that the said Vision Statement is that which is contained within the grey shaded box which appears above the paragraph in question? However it's made all the more confusing when looking at the Full Document. Here it states that "the following Vision Statement has been agreed for the GCNP". What follows however is the wording at paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4. Are we to assume that the wording at paras 3.3 and 3.4 is the actual Vision Statement or is it intended to the wording contained in the greyed out box which appears above the paragraph in question.</p> <p>Under the heading Objectives in the booklet version and at paragraph 3.7 of the Full Version some of the wording in the greyed out box is incoherent. The 3rd line of the 2nd bullet point states "where do so would not significantly affect.....". What does this actually mean?</p>		
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document</p> <p>Since we have been here we have noticed that there is a real sense of community within the village, with all types of people and age groups utilising the pub. We are proud that people in the community who have never met before now know each other. Although more people in the parish could result in more custom we would be concerned that this would be at the detriment of the village's character and that the infrastructure could not support this.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the following page...</i></p>	Thank you for your comment.	None Required

<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
		General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
		<p><i>This comment is from the previous page...</i></p> <p>The traffic is of extreme concern as we have had patrons leave the premises whilst speeding vehicles have been travelling through. We also identify that the pub's popularity also has an impact on parking with vehicles being parked but this obviously has to be balanced against the need for the pub to be viable with sufficient trade. We would want to protect the aesthetic of the village and the local environment. The existing infrastructure, particularly drainage is not fit for the current demand let alone with further development. I would propose that before any new development was considered that this infrastructure would need to be significantly improved.</p>		
	✓	<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document</p> <p>For me the greatest issues to tackle is traffic and speeding. Since we have lived here we have noticed a considerably rise in traffic, particularly due to incidents on the A43, and an increase in the number of vehicles speeding. My fear is that unless something is done a resident or a member of their family will be killed. I would be opposed to any new development on the grounds that this will impact traffic further but most importantly that the existing infrastructure cannot cope as it is, let alone with further development. Recent weather events have lead to flooding on Loddington Road and given climate change these events are set to become more common. The heritage assets, particularly along Church Lane need to be protected as these provide much of the villages character and desirability.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the following page...</i></p>	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required

<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
		General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
		<p><i>This comment is from the previous page...</i></p> <p>More people could also impact on the environment and affect landscape and local wildlife species. I have lived in villages for the majority of my life and have unfortunately witnessed the impact that development has had on those communities. Great Cransley has no infrastructure or facilities to provide for the needs of further people living in the village</p>		
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
		General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
✓		Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i> See GC15 comments	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document A comprehensive plan, which is in my opinion somewhat compromised throughout due to the requirement to build and the proposed siting of the proposed new build	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
	✓	Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document With the town growing as much as it is we are fast losing green spaces and tranquility also wild life is being pushed further out. It's important to keep the village small to keep the views as much as possible and for wildlife etc. I understand that some housing might be needed but it should be kept to a minimum to keep the village a proper English village with peace and tranquility. More housing will increase traffic and if housing needs to be built it needs to be in keeping with the village and provide its own parking. Ideally it would be good to have no extra housing but I guess it is inevitable. Therefore it should be kept to a minimum and affordable.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
✓		Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
		General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document Allow row of new houses along Church Lane as per Mr Claypole's application.</p> <p>Housing/mini industrial units where old Chicken Farm was as per Mr Perkins. Develop Cransley Reservoir lodges & leisure facilities.</p>	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
✓		<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>This response was submitted via a paper form - transcribed by a member of the Steering Group</i></p> <p>See GC4, GC5, GC8 and GC15 in particular</p>	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
	✓	<p>Comment relates to: Booklet version of Pre-submission Document <i>No comment supplied</i></p>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
		<p>Comment supplied without reference to which version of the document or with/without modification: All the village needs is a shop, post office and a bus service, that my friends is only my opinion.</p>	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
	✓	<p>Comment supplied without reference to which version of the document: Key areas for all residents are traffice & parking inadequate now, must be changed if to accomodate additional traffic caused by new development.</p>	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
	✓	<p>Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document A very reasonable considered plan</p>	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required

<u>With</u> Modification:	<u>Without</u> Modification:	Subject: Support or Object the Neighbourhood Plan		
		General Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
✓		Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document A very reasonable considered plan	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
	✓	Comment relates to: FULL Pre-submission Document We do not support any medium to large scale planning applications/developments other than Loddington Road - already granted.	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC1 – Design Principles		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<p>In the Booklet version, under the heading of Policies the opening paragraph at the top of the page has been mistakenly repeated at the top of the following page.</p> <p>Both the Full version and the Booklet version refers to evidence drawn from the public consultation. However, it is not clear to which this public consultation relates to. If it is indeed the 2017 survey then I can see no detail relating to this survey within the documentation provided. I would expect to have been provided with a copy of the questionnaire and also the results of this survey if evidence is to be relied upon in this manner.</p> <p>Also at paragraph 4.3 and also in the Booklet version it seems that an attempt has been made to adduce evidence in support of Design Principles by referencing responses from a public consultation. In particular, reference has been made to Q3 of an unreferenced document where responses have been provided without fully explaining the context.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the next page...</i></p>	<p>Duly noted in respect to the booklet version of the Plan, however the main plan document does not replicate this error and furthermore, the booklet version will not form part of the final plan, it only provided a useful summary for the Regulation 14 Consultation.</p> <p>The public consultation referred to in both documents relates to the survey distributed to all households in the Parish in 2017. A summary of the results of the 2017 survey will be provided within the Consultation Statement. A copy of the survey could have been provided by the Parish Council if requested.</p> <p><i>Response continued on the next page...</i></p>	<p>Heading for Policy GC2 should be moved to be before the text box. ACTIONED</p> <p>In respect to Policy Map A, we agree that this is in the incorrect position.</p> <p>Policy Map A should be moved within the document and be positioned relating to Policy GC3.</p>

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC1 – Design Principles		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
	<p><i>This comment is from the previous page...</i></p> <p>When reviewing the responses to Q3 neither of the four responses to this particular question relate to Design Principles. Accordingly I fail to understand its relevance and do not accept this as cogent evidence in support of this policy. At paragraph 4.4 of the Full Version mention is made to the granting of planning permission for developments in the GC Conversation area that lies within the Settlement Boundary. There then follows a copy of Policy Map A . This relates to the Loddington Road Site RA146 which is not within the GC Conservation Area. Accordingly what is the relevance of including this map at this juncture of the document? Likewise in the Booklet version reference is made to the same Policy Map A which does not appear to have any relevance to Design Principles.</p>	<p><i>Response continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>Disagree, the responses received relate to the new development to seek to preserve and enhance the local character of the Parish and furthermore ensure that development reflects the prevailing pattern of development in the village.</p> <p>To confirm, paragraph 4.4 still relates to Policy GC1 – Design Principles.</p> <p>The text box that follows relates to the next policy in the Plan, namely Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Policy Map A moved to GC3 with notes at the end of GC4 and GC5 also represented by Policy Map A.</p>
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC1 – Design Principles		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	As long as parking is really taken seriously	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	In broad agreement with the design principles in so much as Great Cransley should retain its identity as a small village with open countryside views and peace and quiet. This will be compromised and devalued by increasing the housing population and particularly the siting of housing as proposed in (Loddington Road Site (RA146))	The housing allocation for the Loddington Road site (Policy GC4) must be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, in this respect to Policy GRC2 of the Adopted Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required
YES	Minimal changes and keep green spaces and public footpaths	Agreed. Policies GC8 and GC9 seek to protect open spaces which are important to the character of the village. In addition, improvements to village footpaths is listed as one of the projects for investment in local community infrastructure (see Policy GC15).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC1 – Design Principles		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Any alteration must consider and respect the need to keep for all time the present characteristics of the village.	Noted and agreed.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	Yes it is good to encourage good quality housing for young people to be able to stay within the village.	Duly noted by the SG	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	I have no comments to make in regard to Policy GC2 other than it should be repeated here that Planning Permission will normally be granted for developments within the GC conservation area provided that proposals preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area (see para 4.4). In this regard I would support Policy GC2 provided that such reference is included.	To confirm, Policy GC2 states: <i>Planning permission will normally be granted for developments within the Great Cransley Conservation Area that lies within the Settlement Boundary, <u>provided that proposals preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.</u></i>	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	No new development as previously indicated. I am concerned that all development sites are counter to the plan vision for the community.	This policy reinforces both national and local planning policies (in particular Policy 2 of the JCS). Development should not prejudice the conservation of the historic environment. To clarify, the neighbourhood plan does not allocate any new development within the designated area.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	As long as blends in with the character	Agreed, the aim of the policy is to ensure that proposals sustain and enhance the significance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, proposals should complement their surrounding historic environment through the form, scale, design and materials.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	The policy refers to new build housing but there are several run down farm buildings that could be developed for housing - this should also be restricted in style and its impact on parking etc considered	Just to confirm, the housing allocation (new build) for the Loddington Road site (Policy GC4) is in conformity with Policy GRC2 of the Adopted Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. <i>Response continued on the next page...</i>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
		<p><i>Response continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>We acknowledge that there are other redundant farm buildings in the Parish, the key considerations will be whether they are located within the settlement boundary and whether they are capable of conversion to a residential use.</p>	

Paper Form Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Stagnate or grow - need more houses Young families and children	The level of development in the Parish has been resolved by the requirements of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan and in particular Policy GRC2 and the Neighbourhood Plan has to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.	None Required
YES	Heritage assets - re the old railway which is neglected and unused could be used as a public footway.	One of the projects listed in Policy GC15 of the Neighbourhood Plan is to look to create a Parish Trail. The use of the old railway would need to be assessed further.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC2 – Development in the Conservation Area		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	No development in conservation area	This policy reinforces both national and local planning policies (in particular Policy 2 of the JCS). Development should not prejudice the conservation of the historic environment. To clarify, the neighbourhood plan does not allocate any new development within the designated area.	None Required
YES	No development in conservation area	This policy reinforces both national and local planning policies (in particular Policy 2 of the JCS). Development should not prejudice the conservation of the historic environment. To clarify, the neighbourhood plan does not allocate any new development within the designated area.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>Lovely house designs will fit well into the village, prefer the option with the apartments.</i>	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<p>policy GC3 as drafted seeks to address two matters (1) the delivery of housing on an allocated site, and (2) the delivery of additional development by windfall opportunities or rural exception sites. Our representation relates to matter (2). The policy as drafted refers to Policy 30 of the Core Strategy, but that is not the correct reference. Policy 13 of the Core Strategy is the relevant policy for the consideration of rural exception sites (as correctly referenced at proposed policy GC6). Furthermore, it is misleading to any reader of the Plan for Policy GC3 to refer solely to 100% affordable housing, as planning policy at all levels, including Core Strategy Policy 13, provides for an element of market housing within rural exception schemes in defined circumstances. In light of these problems with the current drafting, it is suggested that Policy GC3 as it relates to matter (ii) is simplified to read: Permission will only be granted on sites adjoining the settlement boundary where the development would comprise one of the exceptions permitted by Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy or by National Policy.</p>	Comments noted and reference should be made to JCS Policy 13 rather than as JCS Policy 30 as detailed in the pre-submission version of the plan.	JCS Policy 13 rather than as JCS Policy 30 ACTIONED
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

<p>Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO</p>	<p>Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery</p>		
	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Steering Group and Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Amendments to NHP</p>
<p>NO</p>	<p>I see no valid evidence to suggest that the majority of residents support the provision of up to 15 dwellings on land to the north of Loddington Road as proposed within SSP GC4. Of the 55 response to the Housing Needs Survey only 36 of respondents were in support of further homes. This survey was sent out to circa 130 households. In my opinion 36 households in support of further homes does not constitute a majority of support!! This support only represents 27.6% of households which no matter how much gloss is applied does not constitute a majority in favour of new homes.</p> <p>Furthermore, this HNS was carried out in February 2020 this being almost 5 years ago. Needs change and as a consequence the data being relied upon to formulate this GCNP is now classified as outdated and no longer fit to be used as a basis for compiling a vision of the local resident’s needs. More importantly, I know of at least 18 households that have changed since the survey in question was carried out. This either means that the opinions of those residents no longer living on the village are invalid or those newcomers to the village are not having their views heard. Either way it seems that this Neighbourhood Plan is based upon evidence that is outdated and no longer relevant.</p> <p>Furthermore, I find the results to the Housing Needs Survey question to be confusing in the format presented. At first glance it seems that 36 respondents are in support of more housing and underneath it is cited that 24 family homes, 22 homes for single people and 19 homes for the elderly are required.</p> <p>Then in the left hand side column it is shown that 19 respondents were not in support of further housing and underneath 7 four bed homes and 10 homes for people with disabilities are required. This all extremely confusing at first glance and a graphical presentation such as shown at figure 2 on page 14 of the HNS report would be far clearer to the reader. At paragraph 4.11 of the Full Document and under the heading</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the next page...</i></p>	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p> <p>The Parish Council cannot therefore propose any less or more than development in the Parish, the Neighbourhood Plan has to be in conformity with the Part 2 Local Plan which has been examined and adopted. The support for further homes in the HNS, is the majority even though the level of response totalled 55. We can look to review the wording to the supporting text of Policy GC3.</p>	<p>None Required</p>

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
	<p><i>This comment is continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>Sub-Objective 2 a of the Booklet version, the criteria is set out in relation to the site depicted on Policy Map A. However, this criteria does not fully reflect the wording at policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan. The wording at Policy GRC2 states inter alia that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Dwellings) will be spaced to allow the retention of views out to the open countryside, • The Development proposals will provide a surface water drainage assessment to demonstrate that SuDS are being used to ensure that the development is safe and does not increase flood risk to any adjacent land. <p>The proposals cited in the GCNP does not include the wording contained in the two bullet points above. Why not?</p>		
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your comment.	None Required
NO	I would be opposed to new development on traffic, environmental, infrastructure, heritage assets and environmental grounds	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p> <p>Furthermore any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to address all technical matters including highway impact, ecology and heriatge considerations.</p>	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Remain unconvinced of the need for further homes, in particular in regard to affordable homes which are often purchased by private individuals in order to rent. I would however support social/council housing.	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<p>There is no proven need to increase the number of houses, or for the type of housing needed. Previous surveys by interpretation eluded to a perceived need for smaller and "cheaper" housing (February 2020 survey).</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the next page...</i></p>	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p><i>Response continued on the next page...</i></p>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
	<p><i>This comment is continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>Only 10 people from the entire village population were in favour of more housing. The JCS local plan Part 1 states that there are no strategic targets for house building in Rural villages. JCS Policy 11 Part 2a states that development in rural areas will be limited to that required to meet a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need which cannot be met within nearby settlements. A mix of 340 homes (affordable 1,2,3 and 4 bedroom homes) are being built along Gipsy Lane Kettering (less than 3 miles away). There is to my knowledge no significant change in Cransley's rural economy. Further housing placed on the proposed site in Loddington Road will be a contradiction of GC1 by significantly altering the characteristics of Loddington Road.</p>	<p><i>Response continued from previous page...</i></p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Housing developments throughout village in ALL areas - Loddington Road, Church Lane, Old Chicken Farm & Barn conversions.	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	None Required
YES	Agreed b -> h in booklet version, but not (a) for max 15 dwellings.	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Although I would lose my wonderful view to the far side of Kettering it was always expected that although the council house building on the east side of Loddington Road ceased in the sixties, that further building would continue in later years.	Noted but the potential impact of a proposed development on a private view is not a planning consideration.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	We do not support affordable housing outside of the settlement boundary	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	None Required
NO	We do not support affordable housing outside of the settlement boundary	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146)		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	Yes great designs were shown at the consultation, preferred the option with the maisonettes.	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	As above	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Though I think 15 properties is too many and not consistent with the rest of Loddington Road in this small area.	To confirm, Policy GC3 refers for the site to provide up to 15 dwellings. The level of development has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan.	None Required
NO	please see comments relating to gc3	The comments relating to Policy GC3 are not applicable to Policy GC4 which deals solely with the Loddington Road site.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	There is a marked inconsistency in the wording contained in the Full document and the Booklet version when referencing Policy GC4. In the Booklet version it is stated that as part of the HNS residents were asked to mark upon it locations they thought might be suitable for development. It is then stated that 25 responses were returned which included the allocated site on Loddington Road. <i>This comment is continued on the next page...</i>	We will undertake a further review of how information was presented to residents and ensure that this is addressed in the Pre-Submission Version of the Plan.	Review information presented and ensure that this is addressed in the Pre-Submission Version of the Plan

<p>Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO</p>	<p>Subject: Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146)</p>		
	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Steering Group and Parish Council Response</p>	<p>Amendments to NHP</p>
	<p><i>This comment is continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>This wording, conspires to elevate the notion that 25 respondents marked the Loddington Road for further development. This is incorrect and in my opinion attempts to promote a bias towards this site. When I read Appendix 2 of the HNS report in response to Q10 it states that it was actually 30 respondents that marked a location not the 25 that is stated in the Booklet version. More importantly, the report does not in any manner give the impression that all 30 respondents marked the Loddington Road site unlike the wording contained in the GCNP. There is a clear lack of transparency within the documents as to how many respondents actually marked the Loddington Road Site as a suitable location for development. The lack of information in this regard cannot in any way be construed as cogent evidence in support of developing this site. Interestingly, the wording in the Full Document does not include any wording in relation to the number of respondents marking the Loddington Road site. Why is there such a marked inconsistency between the wording of the Full Document, the Booklet version and the HNS report?</p> <p>The Loddington Road site (RA146) is not a suitable site for development owing to the numerous challenges that this site faces. Attempts have been made to obtain planning permission in the past without success. The site's boundary line along Loddington Road runs adjacent to a sharp bend with limited visibility thus making entering and exiting the site extremely dangerous. The site is a good example of historical ridge and furrow ploughing dating back to the middle ages and should be protected. There is a marked difference in the ground levels between the field and surface level of Loddington Road thus making this a very challenging site.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the next page...</i></p>		<p>Having reviewed all the information:</p> <p>Of the 55 respondents, 25 marked 1 or more locations on the map.</p> <p>9 of the 25 respondents marked just the Loddington Road site.</p> <p>6 of the 25 respondents marked the Loddington Road site and other locations.</p> <p>9 of the 25 respondents marked other locations, not including the Loddington Road site.</p> <p>1 of the 25 respondents marking is unclear.</p>

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146)		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
	<p><i>This comment is continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>The surface water drains along Loddington Road are infamously in as hocking state of repair continuously causes flooding throughout the village. These drains cannot cope with added capacity. There is a colony of bats nesting adjacent to this proposed site. Any development of this site will have dire consequences to the natural habitat of this protected species.</p>		
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
NO	The infrastructure, particularly drainage is insufficient for the current number of dwellings let alone any more.	Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that the impact of existing infrastructure is addressed including drainage arrangements.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Perfect location and the proposed plans blend I well with the rest of the village	Duly noted.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146)		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	As long as parking does not spill on road causing problems with traffic	Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that highway safety and car parking arrangements meet with the adopted standards.	None Required
NO	Vehicular access would result in unacceptable harm to highway safety, the visibility from the site would be compromised with the bend in the road at this point.	Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that highway safety and car parking arrangements meet with the adopted standards.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<p>This proposed site is totally unsuitable as a development due to: There is no clear line of site for people emerging from the entrance/exit points, particularly the one nearest the existing housing ex council as it is on a bend. No vision of vehicles coming from Loddington direction. It is very likely that this location would cause accidents. There is no footpath outside this development and it appears that there are no plans to provide one. Pedestrians will need to exit directly onto and cross the road. Again vision towards Loddington is very limited due to the bend. A pedestrian crossing will not help much, as again the entrance/exits vision is obscured by the bend. There is an increased likelihood of people being run over. Particularly unsuitable for older people, or wheelchair users. Although attenuation etc. is mentioned, there is no drainage on this side of the road for the inevitable increased surface water to flow in wet conditions. It is likely that this proposed development will increase Cransley's road surface water flooding problems without major upgrading drainage works on the highway.</p> <p><i>This comment is continued on the next page...</i></p>	<p>To confirm, the proposed location and level of development for the Loddington Road site has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan.</p>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146)		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
	<p><i>This comment is continued from the previous page...</i></p> <p>This proposal is a contradiction to GC1, as the character of this part of the village will be significantly altered. There is also the possibility of light pollution issues for the properties opposite and nearby, due to the fact that this development will provide roof lines etc. some 8 to 10 meters above some of the nearby and opposite properties.</p> <p>The volume and type of traffic exiting onto a bend will potentially cause major hazards (refuse collection, oil deliveries and volume of cars etc.)</p> <p>The proposal results in the loss of more farming land, which is rapidly diminishing countryside for a variety of reasons</p> <p>It is not impossible to alter village settlement boundaries, therefore if further housing in Cransley must be provided, then I believe sites 14 and 15 identified in the village planning documentation (the waste ground at the end of Loddington road on the left next to the access to the small industrial area) would be a much more suitable location</p>		
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
NO	I do not agree that this site could support 15 dwellings & I am concerned about the traffic flow of the proposed plan - I do however agree that its important that smaller affordable houses are available	<p>The proposed location and level of development for the Loddington Road site has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that highway safety is addressed, this is a point to be addressed at a later stage.</p>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site (RA146)		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	No problems	Thank you for your comment and support.	None Required
NO	This site has already been selected as the most appropriate site, with which I totally agree. However, not for 15 houses but 8 as recommended.	The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
	Comment supplied without indicating YES or NO: Unsure - concerned about infrastructure for 15 dwellings	Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that the impact of existing infrastructure is addressed.	None Required
	Comment supplied without indicating YES or NO: Unsure - concerned about infrastructure for 15 dwellings	Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that the impact of existing infrastructure is addressed.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC5 – Local Housing Needs		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Policy states affordable housing to meet the needs of the "elderly, disabled, and vulnerable" I think this should also include "to ensure young people can afford to stay in the area".	The Parish Council will look to review this further either within the policy itself or detailed within the supporting text of the policy.	Review policy itself or detailed within supporting text ACTIONED
YES	As above	The Parish Council will look to review this further either within the policy itself or detailed within the supporting text of the policy.	Review policy itself or detailed within supporting text ACTIONED
YES	Houses could be dormer bungalows which have a more aesthetic appeal.	Whilst dormer bungalows may have a more aesthetic appeal, the outcome of the Housing Needs Survey will dictate the housing required for the Parish.	None Required
YES	Affordable house is definitely needed - 1-2 bedroom houses for the young and the elderly.	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	I remain firmly with the majority of residents in the village that does not support further development in Great Cransley.	The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot exceed the level of development proposed strategically.	None Required
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC5 – Local Housing Needs		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	There is a broad range of properties already available within the parish	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	With the non existent public transport to the village or any other facilities, including upkeep of pavements etc home for the elderly would not be appropriate. I don't support the need for private rental homes unless they are social/council houses.	The property type has to be dictated by the findings of the Housing Needs Survey and Assessment.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC5 – Local Housing Needs		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	<p>There is no proven need to increase the number of houses, or for the type of housing needed. Previous surveys by interpretation eluded to a perceived need of smaller and "cheaper" housing (February 2020 survey). Only 10 people from the entire village population were in favour of more housing. The JCS local plan Part 1 states that there are no strategic targets for house building in Rural villages. JCS Policy 11 Part 2a states that development in rural areas will be limited to that required to meet a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need which cannot be met within nearby settlements. A mix of 340 homes (affordable 1,2,3 and 4 bedroom homes are being built along Gipsy Lane Kettering (less than 3 miles away). There is to my knowledge no significant change in Cransleys rural economy. Further housing placed on the proposed site in Loddington Road will be a contradiction of GC1 by significantly altering the characteristics of Loddington Road</p>	<p>The level of development for the Parish has been examined through the adoption of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan is required to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The neighbourhood plan cannot alter the level of development proposed strategically.</p>	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC5 – Local Housing Needs		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	Expand tastefully in all suitable areas	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	1 or 2 bedrooms more necessary than 3 bed houses.	The property type has to be dictated by the findings of the Housing Needs Survey and Assessment.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
	Comment supplied without indicating YES or NO: Unsure - concerned about infrastructure for 15 dwellings	A definition of affordable housing is provided in the glossary of the neighbourhood plan.	None Required
	Comment supplied without indicating YES or NO: Unsure - concerned about infrastructure for 15 dwellings	A definition of affordable housing is provided in the glossary of the neighbourhood plan.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC6 – Settlement Boundary		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
YES	Yes but flexible with this if the need of the village grow	The settlement boundary will be kept under review as part of the next Local Plan and in the review of the neighbourhood plan.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	part of the grass field along Church Lane should be included within the settlement boundary	To confirm, the settlement boundary for Great Cransley was resolved as part of the Part 2 Local Plan .	
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC6 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	Once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan as does the Local Plan. It will be used in the determination of planning applications within the Parish.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC6 – Settlement Boundary		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Yes I would not like the character to change and there views protected	Duly noted.	None Required
NO	Unclear why the proposed site has been incorporated within the settlement boundary, my view is that it is currently open countryside	To confirm, the settlement boundary for Great Cransley was resolved as part of the Part 2 Local Plan and included the Loddington Road site within the boundary.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	This states that "Local residents value the village identity and need to retain its existing environment" Building on the proposed site in Loddington road will be a direct contrast to this value as it will, in my opinion, undermine the form and character of the village. If further housing must be provided in Cransley, then seek to alter the settlement boundary to incorporate new build at sites 14 and 15 identified in the village planning documentation (the waste ground at the end of Loddington road on the left next to the access to the small industrial area)	Tthe proposed location and level of development for the Loddington Road site has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan must be in confirmity with the Local Plan.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC6 – Settlement Boundary		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Support any development which will bring visitors to our local areas and benefit farmers/landlords/ramblers/light industry	Duly noted.	None Required
NO	Agreed apart from a small area of GC8 - LGS1 a local green space - see later	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC7 – Protection of Views		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Yes for far reaching general landscape views	Duly noted.	
YES	Views are important to people living within the village. From policy map E views 55, 56, 89 and 90 are important for dog walkers and others who use Bridle Way. Views and green spaces bring people from outside the village to walk and use local facilities.	Duly noted.	None Required None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC7 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC7 – Protection of Views		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	A number of views have been identified for 'protection'. My opinion is that all residents' views should be protected, not just those adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their rear views, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field,'to maintain the village feel'.	The identification of the views are based upon further assessment conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, views already identified within the Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal and meeting the requirements of Part e of Policy Rs5 of the Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required
NO	A number of views have been identified for 'protection'. My opinion is that all residents' views should be protected, not just those adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their rear views, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field,'to maintain the village feel'.	The identification of the views are based upon further assessment conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, views already identified within the Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal and meeting the requirements of Part e of Policy Rs5 of the Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required
NO	A number of views have been identified for 'protection'. My opinion is that all residents' views should be protected, not just those adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their rear views, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field,'to maintain the village feel'.	The identification of the views are based upon further assessment conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, views already identified within the Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal and meeting the requirements of Part e of Policy Rs5 of the Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required
NO	A number of views have been identified for 'protection'. My opinion is that all residents' views should be protected, not just those adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their rear views, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field,'to maintain the village feel'.	The identification of the views are based upon further assessment conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, views already identified within the Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal and meeting the requirements of Part e of Policy Rs5 of the Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC7 – Protection of Views		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	A number of views have been identified for 'protection'. My opinion is that all residents' views should be protected, not just those adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their rear views, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field,'to maintain the village feel'.	The identification of the views are based upon further assessment conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, views already identified within the Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal and meeting the requirements of Part e of Policy Rs5 of the Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required
NO	A number of views have been identified for 'protection'. My opinion is that all residents' views should be protected, not just those adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their rear views, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field,'to maintain the village feel'.	The identification of the views are based upon further assessment conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, views already identified within the Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal and meeting the requirements of Part e of Policy Rs5 of the Part 2 Local Plan.	None Required
YES	Great Cransley has many unique open views that are essential to maintaining the character of the village	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	Must be protected	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	This policy does not appear to be feasible or realistically achievable if the Loddington Road (RA146) development proposal goes ahead, as the policy seeks to protect and retain the existing village feel and retain open countryside views. These ideals will be compromised if building goes ahead on this proposed site	The proposed location for the Loddington Road site has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan must be in conformity with the Local Plan.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC7 – Protection of Views		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Paper Form Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC7 – Protection of Views		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Agreed all present views	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC8 – Local Green Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Green spaces are important for locals and visitors alike.	Duly noted and agreed.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC8 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Green Spaces have been identified as 'important'. My opinion is that all residents' views over local green space should be important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their green space, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field, identified as 'of particular importance to them'.	This is the purpose of Policy GC8 which is protecting the two Local Green Spaces identified in the plan which meet with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC8 – Local Green Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Again, a number of Green Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ views over local green space should be important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their green space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified as ‘of particular importance to them’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC8 which is protecting the two Local Green Spaces identified in the plan which meet with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Green Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ views over local green space should be important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their green space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified as ‘of particular importance to them’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC8 which is protecting the two Local Green Spaces identified in the plan which meet with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Green Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ views over local green space should be important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their green space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified as ‘of particular importance to them’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC8 which is protecting the two Local Green Spaces identified in the plan which meet with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Green Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ views over local green space should be important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their green space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified as ‘of particular importance to them’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC8 which is protecting the two Local Green Spaces identified in the plan which meet with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC8 – Local Green Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Again, a number of Green Spaces have been identified as 'important'. My opinion is that all residents' views over local green space should be important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their green space, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field, identified as 'of particular importance to them'.	This is the purpose of Policy GC8 which is protecting the two Local Green Spaces identified in the plan which meet with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Loddington Road (RA146) development proposal will lose green space, albeit for some reason not protected green space?	Acknowledged however, the Loddington Road site has been examined and adopted as Policy GRC2 of the Part 2 Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan has to conform with the Local Plan policy.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC8 – Local Green Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Agreed all apart from a small area. Footpath GG2 joins road Bridle Way at the far end. Then GG4 crosses over this small area which may sufficiently be enough for several small houses on LGS1.	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Online Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<i>Although i remain indifferent with policy GC9 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.</i>	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Again, a number of Open Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ should have open space identified as important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their open space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified ‘because of its value to local character’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC9 which is protecting the seven identified important open spaces which don't meet the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF in respect of Local Green Spaces but need to be protected due to their value to local biodiversity, amenity and historical context.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Open Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ should have open space identified as important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their open space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified ‘because of its value to local character’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC9 which is protecting the seven identified important open spaces which don't meet the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF in respect of Local Green Spaces but need to be protected due to their value to local biodiversity, amenity and historical context.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Open Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ should have open space identified as important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their open space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified ‘because of its value to local character’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC9 which is protecting the seven identified important open spaces which don't meet the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF in respect of Local Green Spaces but need to be protected due to their value to local biodiversity, amenity and historical context.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Open Spaces have been identified as ‘important’. My opinion is that all residents’ should have open space identified as important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their open space, across the setaside and Claypoles’ sheep field, identified ‘because of its value to local character’.	This is the purpose of Policy GC9 which is protecting the seven identified important open spaces which don't meet the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF in respect of Local Green Spaces but need to be protected due to their value to local biodiversity, amenity and historical context.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Again, a number of Open Spaces have been identified as 'important'. My opinion is that all residents' should have open space identified as important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their open space, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field, identified 'because of its value to local character'.	This is the purpose of Policy GC9 which is protecting the seven identified important open spaces which don't meet the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF in respect of Local Green Spaces but need to be protected due to their value to local biodiversity, amenity and historical context.	None Required
NO	Again, a number of Open Spaces have been identified as 'important'. My opinion is that all residents' should have open space identified as important, not just LGS1 - adjacent to Loddington Rd & south of Northfield Rd. Residents living along Loddington Rd, on the west of the village, from The Three Cranes to the top of the hill, need their open space, across the setaside and Claypoles' sheep field, identified 'because of its value to local character'.	This is the purpose of Policy GC9 which is protecting the seven identified important open spaces which don't meet the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF in respect of Local Green Spaces but need to be protected due to their value to local biodiversity, amenity and historical context.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Retain or enhance.	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	I think that the roadside verge GC9d should extend down to the village hall	Duly noted.	Parish Council to review suggestion and action accordingly in the Plan.
YES	General agreement, but the Loddington Road (RA146) development proposal will contradict this policy by losing open space and altering natural habitats by removing parts of hedgerows and humanising the remaining hedge line in front of the development, as any existing wildlife will be driven away	The proposed location and level of development for the Loddington Road site has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan must be in conformity with the Local Plan.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Paper Form Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Agree all	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Suggest including roadway to cemetery	Thank you for suggestion.	Parish Council to review suggestion and action accordingly in the

Paper Form Representations

Do you agree with this policy?	Subject: Policy GC9 – Important Open Spaces		
YES or NO			Plan.
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Online Representations

Do you agree with this policy?	Subject: Policy GC10 – Biodiversity		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES or NO			
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC10 – Biodiversity		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC10 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC10 – Biodiversity		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Again compromised by proposed Loddington Road (RA146) development as this build will have, in my view, an unacceptable impact on the residential properties surrounding the site, both by introducing noise and disturbance and potentially causing an infestation of vehicle movements through the village	<p>The proposed location and level of development for the Loddington Road site has been examined through the adoption of Policy GRC2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan must be in conformity with the Local Plan .Any subsequent planning application for the development of this site would need to ensure that highway safety is addressed as well as impact on residential amenity and all other technical matters.</p>	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC10 – Biodiversity		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Develop Cransley Reservoir for all to enjoy not just Sailing Club? Public boating/fishing/swimming/rambling - Dam + Pumphouse Museum	This is not a matter that can be addressed within the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council note your aspirations for the reservoir.	None Required
YES	Agree all a - f	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC11 – Cransley Reservoir		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC11 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC11 – Cransley Reservoir		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Paper Form line Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC11 – Cransley Reservoir		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	See above comments & holiday lodges/Yurts/Glamping etc	This is not a matter that can be addressed within the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council note your aspirations for the reservoir.	None Required
YES	Local wildlife site K1110 - any development must be compatible with the area as it now is.	Duly noted and agreed.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC12 – Village Facilities		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	If there are to be improvements made, It would be great to enhance the facilities for young people, so they could get together in the villages without the need to travel into town, perhaps a music / band practice studio and events with local youth in mind.	Thank you for your comment. The Parish Council could look at adding this suggestion to their project list.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC12 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC12 – Village Facilities		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	I am concerned that we be clear about the use of the bus shelter- last year it lapsed on occasion to a Meetup & smoke weed facility	The matters raised are outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan but the Parish Council are aware of the issues relating to the use of the bus shelter.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC12 – Village Facilities		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Information on defib use - Report?? Has it save a life yet? Bus shelter - what about a bus? Parking Bridle Way - laybys, rubbish skip, fuel survey?	The questions posed are matters outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan but the Parish Council are aware of the issues/matters raised.	None Required
YES	All agreed, ie sub-objective 4a	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC13 – Supporting the Development of Small Businesses		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Definitely this is important to the survival of the village and will help young people.	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC13 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC13 – Supporting the Development of Small Businesses		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Unsure about this, there would need to things in place noise traffic etc	As detailed in Policy GC13, any proposal would need to meet the criteria specified which includes the points raised in your response.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	I don't see how anymore businesses would help the village. It would make the village busier with traffic. Village is close to other local amenities	As detailed in Policy GC13, in particular part ii any proposal will need to demonstrate no harm in terms of highway safety, traffic generation and provide suitable car parking.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC13 – Supporting the Development of Small Businesses		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	A small industrial estate with mini units so enterprising villagers can start businesses ie land next to village hall/into field	Duly noted, any proposals will need to meet with the requirements of the development plan.	None Required
YES	Agreed with all proposals indicated being met. Unusual local stone buildings should be now used for small businesses if suitable.	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC14 – Home Based Businesses		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC14 my overriding view on the GCNPO is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC14 – Home Based Businesses		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Since arrival of care home noise and parking a Big problem spoiling the area just a accident black spot	As detailed in Policy GC13, in particular part ii any proposal will need to demonstrate no harm in terms of highway safety, traffic generation and provide suitable car parking.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	As long as it's not detrimental to the village	Duly noted.	
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Paper Form Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC14 – Home Based Businesses		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	Should be fully supported we need a few Air BnBs as Bridle Way application	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	Agreed - North Northants Council should always visit such sites - reality cannot be seen by looking at a street map.	Outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, however, the Parish Council acknowledges the issue raised.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Care to ensure any visual effects to blend with existing architecture	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	Absolutely! A history trail is an excellent idea, a great way for everyone to learn more about local history, appreciate our heritage and ancestors, also to ensure knowledge is passed on to the next generations.	Duly noted, thank you for your support for this project.	None Required
YES	The idea of a history trial was mentioned at the consultation meeting, this would be excellent.	Duly noted, thank you for your support for this project.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Traffic calming will be required as the proposed site is on a bend which will be dangerous if traffic is not calmed down. Pedestrians will be at high risk crossing the road to get to the play area plus there is no pavement on the east side of the road beyond no. 20 going north.	Duly noted, thank you for your support for this project.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Also NO Re traffic calming & flashing sign next to bus shelter obscured by hedge - move towards Broughton next to 30 MPH sign. At Loddington Road end - BIG sign 1 metre sq - DO NOT SPEED THROUGH OUR VILLAGE!	Outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council acknowledges this issue.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC15 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	No new development would mean that this policy is redundant	There is the development of the Loddington Road site which could contribute towards the projects listed.	None Required
NO	Sub-Objective 4b; In my opinion point 'c' needs to be a higher priority than point 'b'. Traffic calming measures are an absolute necessity, bearing in mind the increase in number of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit over a 4 year period. In 2019 45% of vehicles exceeded the 30mph; in 2023 that rose to 63%. Surely this is a concern and a significant enough increase for the Highway Authority to take action. An additional concern is that both surveys were completed in winter months, a season when you would expect cars to be travelling at slower speeds bearing in mind weather and road conditions. It is concerning that an 18% increase has been recorded over a 4 year period. As a consequence, improvements to village street lighting and improvements to the village footpaths, especially along poorly lit parts of Loddington Rd, are essential and far more important than a Parish trail.	To confirm, the list of requirements (a-c) to this policy are not listed in any order of priority, all of which are important considerations. Duly noted on your comments concerning street lighting, however improvements to the village footpaths is listed in Policy GC15.	None Required
NO	Sub-Objective 4b; In my opinion point 'c' needs to be a higher priority than point 'b'. Traffic calming measures are an absolute necessity, bearing in mind the increase in number of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit over a 4 year period. In 2019 45% of vehicles exceeded the 30mph; in 2023 that rose to 63%. Surely this is a concern and a significant enough increase for the Highway Authority to take action. An additional concern is that both surveys were completed in winter months, a season when you would expect cars to be travelling at slower speeds bearing in mind weather and road conditions. It is concerning that an 18% increase has been recorded over a 4 year period. As a consequence, improvements to village street lighting and improvements to the village footpaths, especially along poorly lit parts of Loddington Rd, are essential and far more important than a Parish trail.	To confirm, the list of requirements (a-c) to this policy are not listed in any order of priority, all of which are important considerations. Duly noted on your comments concerning street lighting, however improvements to the village footpaths is listed in Policy GC15.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	<p>Sub-Objective 4b; In my opinion point 'c' needs to be a higher priority than point 'b'. Traffic calming measures are an absolute necessity, bearing in mind the increase in number of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit over a 4 year period. In 2019 45% of vehicles exceeded the 30mph; in 2023 that rose to 63%. Surely this is a concern and a significant enough increase for the Highway Authority to take action. An additional concern is that both surveys were completed in winter months, a season when you would expect cars to be travelling at slower speeds bearing in mind weather and road conditions. It is concerning that an 18% increase has been recorded over a 4 year period. As a consequence, improvements to village street lighting and improvements to the village footpaths, especially along poorly lit parts of Loddington Rd, are essential and far more important than a Parish trail.</p>	<p>To confirm, the list of requirements (a-c) to this policy are not listed in any order of priority, all of which are important considerations.</p> <p>Duly noted on your comments concerning street lighting, however improvements to the village footpaths is listed in Policy GC15.</p>	None Required
NO	<p>Sub-Objective 4b; In my opinion point 'c' needs to be a higher priority than point 'b'. Traffic calming measures are an absolute necessity, bearing in mind the increase in number of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit over a 4 year period. In 2019 45% of vehicles exceeded the 30mph; in 2023 that rose to 63%. Surely this is a concern and a significant enough increase for the Highway Authority to take action. An additional concern is that both surveys were completed in winter months, a season when you would expect cars to be travelling at slower speeds bearing in mind weather and road conditions. It is concerning that an 18% increase has been recorded over a 4 year period. As a consequence, improvements to village street lighting and improvements to the village footpaths, especially along poorly lit parts of Loddington Rd, are essential and far more important than a Parish trail.</p>	<p>To confirm, the list of requirements (a-c) to this policy are not listed in any order of priority, all of which are important considerations.</p> <p>Duly noted on your comments concerning street lighting, however improvements to the village footpaths is listed in Policy GC15.</p>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
NO	Sub-Objective 4b; In my opinion point 'c' needs to be a higher priority than point 'b'. Traffic calming measures are an absolute necessity, bearing in mind the increase in number of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit over a 4 year period. In 2019 45% of vehicles exceeded the 30mph; in 2023 that rose to 63%. Surely this is a concern and a significant enough increase for the Highway Authority to take action. An additional concern is that both surveys were completed in winter months, a season when you would expect cars to be travelling at slower speeds bearing in mind weather and road conditions. It is concerning that an 18% increase has been recorded over a 4 year period. As a consequence, improvements to village street lighting and improvements to the village footpaths, especially along poorly lit parts of Loddington Rd, are essential and far more important than a Parish trail.	To confirm, the list of requirements (a-c) to this policy are not listed in any order of priority, all of which are important considerations. Duly noted on your comments concerning street lighting, however improvements to the village footpaths is listed in Policy GC15.	None Required
NO	Sub-Objective 4b; In my opinion point 'c' needs to be a higher priority than point 'b'. Traffic calming measures are an absolute necessity, bearing in mind the increase in number of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit over a 4 year period. In 2019 45% of vehicles exceeded the 30mph; in 2023 that rose to 63%. Surely this is a concern and a significant enough increase for the Highway Authority to take action. An additional concern is that both surveys were completed in winter months, a season when you would expect cars to be travelling at slower speeds bearing in mind weather and road conditions. It is concerning that an 18% increase has been recorded over a 4 year period. As a consequence, improvements to village street lighting and improvements to the village footpaths, especially along poorly lit parts of Loddington Rd, are essential and far more important than a Parish trail.	To confirm, the list of requirements (a-c) to this policy are not listed in any order of priority, all of which are important considerations. Duly noted on your comments concerning street lighting, however improvements to the village footpaths is listed in Policy GC15.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<p>Option 1 would be most satisfactory for the site RA/146 which is for 8 houses and includes retention of the hedge on the present roadside.</p> <p>The old railway line would need contribution to become a village trail and be part of the historical part of Gt Cransley.</p>	Duly noted, however RA146 could provide for up to 15 dwellings as detailed in Policy GC4. The Parish Council acknowledges your suggestion to include the old railway line as part of the village trail.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Traffic calming on Loddington Road & village footpaths are both required regardless of any new housing, the traffic surveys do not seem to reflect the daily realities other than a significant increase in speeding traffic between surveys (45.3% to 63%). All other villages in the area have traffic calming measures, the pavements are practically unusable when trying to navigate with a pushchair, wheelchair or invalid scooter necessitating frequent periods on accessing the road.	Duly noted, the Parish Council are aware of the difficulties in the village with parked cars on pavements whilst outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, this point is acknowledged by the Parish Council.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<p>With reference to creating a parish trail, I suggest the landowners of the disused rail track be invited to open this as a potential walking/jogging route for villagers/others. A circular route could be created, as Bridleway bisects the track. so could be joined at the southern end of the village and emerge at the northern end ie the top of Loddington Road. The land is largely redundant, it appears, so little or no financial loss to the landowners may arise but compensation could be sought from a developer, if necessary.</p> <p>Modifications/remedial action would be required to make the route accessible and safe for all.</p> <p>In addition, the field adjacent to the dirt road (top of Loddington Road), which is now largely overgrown and unused, could be turned into a green space creating a haven for nature and walks for the well being of all. There is sufficient space on the opposite side of the road, in the longer term, to create limited parking and, if successful, reopen the cafe facility that previously existed on the site. Understandably, the landowner should be compensated and again the developer might be approached in this regard</p>	<p>Duly noted, whilst outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council acknowledge the need to engage with the owners of the disused rail track and this project will need to be further assessed. Your comments on the potential use of the field adjacent to the dirt road are acknowledged.</p>	None Required
YES	<p>I think the surface water flooding of the roads through the village should be incorporated within this</p>	<p>Duly noted. This could be added to the list as surface water flooding alleviation measures if you consider this as being a priority in the Parish, clearly any future development of Loddington Road will need to address such issues.</p> <p>Parish Council to review and add to the list if considered a priority in the Parish.</p>	None Required
YES	<p><i>No comment supplied</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>	None Required
YES	<p><i>No comment supplied</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Footpaths at present are unsuitable for people with disabilities when they mend a piece they leave a bit next to it that is worse. I have fallen twice outside my bungalow.	Outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council acknowledge this issue and sorry to hear of this situation.	None Required
YES	Traffic awareness & parking are key issues at present, some arrangements are dangerous	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC16 – Parking in New Developments		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Consideration needs to be taken into account of large school buses and more importantly, the large farm machinery that drives up and down Loddington Road most days and if vehicles are parked on the road, can cause a lot of congestion because the area is surrounded by working farms.	Outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council are aware of this issue in the village.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Layby parking next to cherry trees and bungalows along Bridle Way and wide areas of Loddington Road	Outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council acknowledges this issue.	None Required
NO	Although i remain indifferent with policy GC16 my overriding view on the GCNP is that it should not be endorsed. it is based on outdated surveys and will always be subservient to the Kettering Site Specific Local Plan which was adopted in 2021.	The Neighbourhood Plan has been supported with appropriate evidence base to support the objectives of the plan. In addition, once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan (including the Part 2 Local Plan).	None Required
NO	<i>No comment supplied</i>		None Required
NO	As above. If no new development is granted no new parking is required.	Duly noted, however, there is the development of the Loddington Road site.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC16 – Parking in New Developments		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	Parking for the proposed RA/146 is included for owners of houses and visitors which is good.	Duly noted.	None Required
YES	This is a major issue as people will park everywhere there's a space and spoil verges accidents	The inclusion of Policy GC16 is to prevent the displacement of parking onto the roads	None Required
NO	No mention of adequate access and egress for refuse/recycling collection, deliveries, emergency vehicles etc	This is addressed within Part b of Policy GC16, as 'other road users'. In any planning application, such matters will also be addressed and will need to demonstrate that they don't compromise highway safety.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC16 – Parking in New Developments		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Paper Form Representations

Do you agree with this policy? YES or NO	Subject: Policy GC16 – Parking in New Developments		
	Comment	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	On footpath parking is terrible, particularly for children's buggies & wheelchairs. Public transport, there is no public transport of any kind for the people with no cars ie older resident unable to drive.	Outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council are aware of this issue in the village and the inconvenience it causes pedestrians. In respect to the provision of public transport in the village, this is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Parish Council are aware that not all residents have access to cars or are able to drive.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required
YES	<i>No comment supplied</i>	Thank you for your support.	None Required

Respondent:	Do you agree with this policy?:	Comment + Policy No R = Resident B = Business O = Organisation
O		Comment relates to: General Improved public transport could mitigate some of the parking issues. Increasing no of houses means more support of church, pub etc increasing likelihood of their survival into future.
R		Comment relates to: RA/146 Masterplan Option 3 is preferable to 1 & 2
R		Comment relates to: General The only issue that we have is with the opinion of the authority that 63% of vehicles exceeding the speed limit, does not warrant the [?] taking action to reduce speeds. We have no concerns with development in the village, providing traffic calming measures are taken.
R		Comment relates to: General Could another new village be considered to meet housing need eg at the northern end of Northfield Road-> no additional traffic in Cransley
R		Comment relates to: General How do we get/consider the views of people who would want to be part of a future Cransley, not just existing residents eg young adults who can't afford to live here.
R		Comment relates to: General As a country we have a large and pressing need for more housing, particular social housing and affordable housing. The GCNP supports this to some degree, but could all 15 dwellings be social/affordable? Where else could we build?
R		Comment relates to: GC12 Public transport (buses) would reduce car traffic considerably
R		Comment relates to: GC10 Biodiversity has declined badly in the last 40 years. It needs pro-active action on our part to reverse this, the environment is getting sterile.

Respondent:	Do you agree with this policy?:	Comment + Policy No R = Resident B = Business O = Organisation
R		Comment relates to: GC2 I hope Kettering bricks will be counted as suitable building material to fit in.
R		Comment relates to: GC3 The nature of any development is important. No narrow roads, no removal of trees, no heating boilers (airpumps compulsory), if possible green roofs. I hope Kettering bricks will be counted as suitable building material to fit in.
R		Comment relates to: GC16 Real concern regarding massive increase in speeding through village; 45.3% > 30mph in 2019 increased to 63% in 2023 With [?] possible development speeding will be an even greater risk.
R		Comment relates to: GC8 & GC9 Add 'Claypole's field' - bordering Loddington Road and north side of Church Lane should be considered for Important Open Spaces. The 'set aside' off Loddington Road should also be considered Important Open Spaces/Local Green Spaces
R		Comment relates to: GC7 Views across fields should be protected from all properties; not just the top 10 Views across both sides of Loddington Road, and from Bridle/Church Lane front and rear should be protected for residents.
R		Comment relates to: GC8 & GC9 I concur with the existing protected spaces but would add ' Claypole's field' behind Loddington Road and Church Lane and the set aside adjacent/behind the houses on Loddington Road. These are both areas with views and open spaces critical to the village.
R		Comment relates to: GC7 I feel that the views that are viewed as 'top' or 'popular' should include the views from the houses on both sides of Loddington Road over open countryside behind these houses.
R		Comment relates to: GC10 The protection of the environment and ancient woodland should ensure no building takes place on 'Claypole's field' adjacent to Loddington Road or Church Lane. This is critical area for preservation of environment.

Respondent:	Do you agree with this policy?:	Comment + Policy No R = Resident B = Business O = Organisation
R		Comment relates to: GC16 Very concerned regarding traffic on Loddington Road. Amount of speeding traffic and the excessive speed is very worrying. I note both surveys done in winter. Suggest a summer survey to assess impact at different time of year.
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC1 <i>No comment supplied</i>
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC5 I agree with this need for appropriate housing
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC8 Why isn't the field that runs alongside Church Lane opposite Cransley Hall not designated a Local Green Space? Affording it protection from development.
R	YES	Comment relates to: Not specified Option 2 looks good
R		Comment relates to: GC9 Can the field alongside Church Lane not be included as an Important Open Space?
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC7 I agree with this policy
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC6 Strongly agree with this policy
R		Comment relates to: GC1 Ideal site for affordable housing
R		Comment relates to: GC4 I like Fig 18 Stats in keeping with the 'flow' of the village

Respondent:	Do you agree with this policy?:	Comment + Policy No R = Resident B = Business O = Organisation
R		Comment relates to: GC3 15 is too many for the site GC2
R		Comment relates to: GC16 Can the old railway be reopened as a cycle track into Kettering?
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC16 I support all the policies. Main concern is speeding through the village, with the wet roads and poor drainage causes problems for pedestrians.
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC3 Fully support
R		Comment relates to: GC10 Protect and improve footpaths - footpath along Loddington Road very poor, uneven particularly for pushchairs, invalid vehicles etc - cars parking on pavements etc
R		Comment relates to: General Dangerous parking on the corner of Church Lane and Loddington Road - no clear sight when coming out of Church Lane re cars parked on corner.
R		Comment relates to: GC316 Traffic through village increased and feel a real priority that calming measures taken to slow down and maybe decrease traffic. Concern that dangerous to families moving in if nothing done.
R		Comment relates to: GC4 Proposed build is on a blind bend and access potentially unsafe. Traffic calming either end of village would really help to slow everyone down.
R		Comment relates to: GC4 Dorma style dwellings are more attractive and less height impact.

Respondent:	Do you agree with this policy?:	Comment + Policy No R = Resident B = Business O = Organisation
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC8 Totally agree. This space should be conserved as the historic centre of the village.
R		Comment relates to: GC3 Land north of Loddington Rd proposed for development does not appear large enough tp accommodate 10-15 houses.
R	YES	Comment relates to: GC3 I love it here. I like play area.

Statutory Representations

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Respondent: Definitive Map Officer, North Northamptonshire Council			
References to PROWs within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Viewed and agreed.	Noted	No further action required.
Respondent: National Allotment Society			
Allotment provision within the Parish	Would be good to see future allotment provision within the plan. The NAC can assist in providing advice on setting up allotment sites as part of developments to enhance biodiversity. With only around 130 properties within the Parish, do not expect the demand to be high in the short term. May be worth considering the NAS's suggested provision for the future which is 20 plots per 1,000 households	Given the existing characteristics of the Parish, household demand is likely to be small. Could consider the provision of an allotment in the Parish as a project to address in the Community Action section of the Plan. Steering Group and Parish Council to consider further.	Possible inclusion to the provision of allotments within the Community Action section of the plan.
Respondent: National Highways			
Strategic Road Network	The SRN closest to the NDP area is the A14 trunk road, which is outside the boundary of the plan area. We have considered the contents of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and as the plan does not introduce any new development sites or transport related policies that are likely to impact upon our network, we consider that the contents of the plan are for local determination and we have no other comments to make.	Noted	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Respondent: National Grid Agent: Avison Young			
National Grid assets	The only National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) asset falling with the Neighbourhood Area boundary is: Asset Description ZA ROUTE TWR (002 - 300C): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: COTTAM – GRENDON. No further comments other than to add both contact details for NGET and their agent (as specified in the letter) to be added to the consultation database.	Noted	No further action required.
Respondent: National Gas Transmission Agent: Avison Young			
National Gas Transmission	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. No further comments other than to add both contact details for National Gas Transmission and their agent (as specified in the letter) to be added to the consultation database.	Noted	No further action required.
Respondent: Environment Agency			
Flood Risk	The land within the neighbourhood plan boundary is located mainly within Environment Agency Flood Zone 1 and at low risk of flooding from main rivers.	Flood Risk management is dealt within Policy 5 (Water Environment, Resources and Flood Risk Management) of the Adopted North Northamptonshire Local Plan and Policy NEH1 (Local Flood Risk Management) of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan, there is no need to replicate within the neighbourhood plan.	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Flood Risk	We note that the Neighbourhood Plan does not specifically discuss flood risk (presumably, as it is low). However, I would suggest that for completeness, a flood risk section should be included as there is some land within Flood Zones 2 and 3.	We do not consider that it is appropriate to include a flood risk section within the plan since flood risk is already addressed within both Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plans.	No further action required.
Foul drainage and water quality	<p>Any future developments should look at including measures for improving and enhancing the water environment and follow the sewerage hierarchy guidance for foul drainage. We encourage the Parish Council to consult with Anglian Water Services as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process to seek assurances that this Water Recycling Centre and the related sewerage infrastructure is adequate to be able to cope with any new development in Great Cransley.</p> <p>This approach is in line with paragraph 3.2 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan which defines the Vision as 'By 2031, Great Cransley will have retained its character and identity as a traditional small Northamptonshire village. The surrounding countryside, green spaces and village heritage assets will have been protected and enhanced while village facilities and infrastructure will have been improved, improving the quality of life for its residents. The valued aspects of open countryside views, peace, quiet and a safe environment for residents and visitors of all ages will have been retained or enhanced.</p>	The level of development for Great Cransley was originally set out within Policy GRC 2 of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. Capacity would be addressed at the time of a formal planning application submission.	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Foul drainage and water quality	<p>Furthermore, we see on Page 71 that infrastructure is defined as 'Basic services necessary for development to take place e.g., roads, electricity, sewerage, water, education and health facilities'.</p> <p>In addition, it is considered that, to help reduce the impact of new development on the foul drainage network, the Plan should encourage water efficiency measures as part of it so that less water has to go to the WRC. Perhaps Policy GC1 (Design principles) or the associated text could include wording encouraging this and give some examples of how this could be achieved such as having water efficient fittings in kitchens and bathrooms. This would be in line with paragraph 4.22 of the adopted North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which gives the example that improving water efficiency within homes and businesses reduces demand on potable water and sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>We note that while the Cransley Reservoir is mentioned in the plan, there is no specific mention of the Water Framework Directive or water quality. The Parish is located within the catchment of the Loddington Arm (Ise) WFD water body (GB105032045150). It is important to ensure that developments do not cause deterioration to this WFD waterbody. It is recommended that reference to this is included in the Plan.</p>	<p>Water use is already addressed within Policy 9 (Sustainable Buildings) of the Adopted North Northamptonshire Local Plan, there is no need to replicate within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Further detail to be provided within the supporting text of Policy GC11.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p> <p>Action: suggest additional text to paragraph 4.33 as follows:</p> <p>The Parish is located within the catchment of the Loddington Arm Water Framework Directive water body (GB105032045150). New developments within the Parish should ensure that they do not cause deterioration to this Water Framework Directive waterbody</p> <p>Actioned</p>

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Groundwater and contaminated land	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 180 [now paragraph 187] states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution.</p> <p>We recommend that the following is considered for adding in the Plan:</p> <p>The Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan (GCNP) area mainly lies over geology classified as Secondary A aquifers and Unproductive strata, with a Secondary Undifferentiated aquifer and a Secondary B aquifer. The Secondary A aquifers can support local abstractions and baseflow to streams and rivers whereas Secondary B aquifers can store minor and yield limited amounts of groundwater in localised features. The Secondary Undifferentiated aquifers have variable characteristics and can be classified as minor or non-aquifers whereas Unproductive strata have low permeability that have negligible significance for water supply or river base flow. The use (or potential use) of groundwater in the area makes parts of the area vulnerable to pollution from certain types of development.</p>	<p>Policy 6 (Development on Brownfield Land and Land Affected by Contamination) of the Adopted North Northamptonshire Local Plan, there is no need to replicate the matters addressed within this policy within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Any planning application involving brownfield land will also be subject to the requirements of Policy 6 of the JCS.</p>	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Groundwater and contaminated land	<p>The majority of the land covered by the Plan is predominantly greenfield. However, any brownfield site should be investigated in accordance with the guidance specified in the representation. Our records show there is one historic landfill is located within the Neighbourhood Plan area (A containment trench at the former Cransley Ironworks which was active in 1990 with inert waste and special waste deposited).</p> <p>We are aware that some development has since taken place on the site but it may still be worth identifying in the Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan so if there are any remaining risks posed they can be appropriate managed. Related to this, our records show an active IPPC authorisation for the company Little Moons which operates from part of this site.</p> <p>Finally, the representation suggests that businesses at the former Cransley ironworks site are consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Need to review whether businesses were consulted upon the Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>Action: review list of businesses consulted to date on the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Businesses in the Parish were part of the 6 week consultation. Their responses are set out in Appendix G of the Consultation Statement.</p>

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Respondent: Sport England			
Sport Facilities	<p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with paragraph 103 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence.</p> <p>It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p>	Great Cransley has limited facilities and the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect open spaces (including Local Green Spaces), woodlands and the network of footpaths together with the facilities including the children's play area and the village memorial hall, all of which are of importance to the local community.	No further action is required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Sport Facilities	<p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p>	<p>Acknowledged by both the Steering Group and the Parish Council.</p> <p>The only housing proposed within the Part 2 Local Plan and within the neighbourhood plan relates to the site to the north of Loddington Road (for up to a maximum of 15 dwellings proposed). As detailed in Policy GC4, contributions will be sought towards the projects listed in Policy GC15 which includes the creation of a Parish Trail and improvements to the village footpaths. At this current time, no further facilities are considered a priority for the Parish.</p>	No further action required.
Respondent: Natural England			
National Environment	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Attached annex provided by Natural England addresses the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None needed.</p> <p>Policies GC1 part f, GC4 part g and GC11 address issues provided within the annex.</p>	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Respondent: Lead Planning Archaeologist, North Northamptonshire Council			
Loddington Road site	<p>I note that the proposed development site at Loddington Road (RA146 in the Kettering site allocations) is referred to and would mention therefore that when KBC allocated the site, the then County Archaeological Advisor commented that further information would be needed on the archaeological potential of the site. In practice this means that any application to develop the site should be accompanied by an assessment of the site by archaeological trial trenching. The site does contain ridge and furrow earthworks but the presence of such earthworks does not preclude the presence of earlier remains, and earthwork remains of former house sites are preserved a short distance to the south east.</p>	<p>Part f of Policy GC4 states that pre-determinative archaeological evaluation should be carried out to mitigate any impact of any heritage assets of archaeological interest</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
	<p>The former house sites referred to above are within Local Green Space 1, and I am pleased to see that this site is considered to be of local significance. I would encourage the community to bear in mind the archaeological heritage of the village as there are several sites like this around the edges of the modern settlement where earlier settlement may be present. Information on these sites can be obtained from the Northants Historic Environment Record and can be used to provide interest to initiatives such as a village walking trail.</p>	<p>LGS1 is designated as a Local Green Space given its importance to the local community and of its significance in particular regard to the site's archaeological interest.</p> <p>Noted on the initiative of a village walking trail, this could be explored further by the Parish Council</p>	<p>No further action is required.</p> <p>Action: PC to consider whether the initiative of a village walking trail could be explored and listed within the non-land use action section of the plan.</p>

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Loddington Road site	<p>On balance, while it is positive to see consideration of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings within the parish, there should also be an awareness of the potential impacts of development of all sorts on buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>The policies for Built Environment and Heritage Assets contain no references to buried remains but these are vulnerable to development and once removed cannot be replaced. Therefore, the relevant chapter of the NPPF seeks to ensure that sufficient information is provided with applications to allow a balanced decision to be made, and that where development will have an impact on archaeology, there is provision for the investigation, recording and publication of the remains.</p>	Duly noted and should be considered should a planning application be submitted providing an appropriate level of archaeological assessment.	No further action is required.
Respondent: Resident (submitted via email report rather than online form)			
Vision, Core Objectives and Policy Maps	There should be clarification at the beginning of the Plan, either in the Foreword or the Introduction, but also at section 5.1 regarding the limitations of the scope permitted in a Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically, that NP policies can only relate to land use. Non-land use issues that may be valid and concern residents such as traffic and transport are excluded from the scope of a NP.	<p>The introduction of the plan is a standard approach which has been adopted in many neighbourhood plans which have been found to be sound.</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraph 5.1 clarifies issues raised during the preparation of the plan that cannot be addressed directly by planning policy are of importance to the local community and are listed as a set of community actions.</p>	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
General Comments	It is not at all clear in this document V7.1.2 what is 'Policy wording', and what is 'supporting evidence wording'. It is the Policy wording that will be applied as a Material Consideration in making future planning decisions, not the supporting evidence, so this must be made clearer.	<p>Policies GC1 to GC16 are distinguished from the supporting evidence by being presented in boxes with bold text, this again is a standard approach in the preparation of neighbourhood plans and which has been endorsed by Plan Examiners.</p> <p>The evidence provides support for the policy content and wording.</p>	No further action required.
Policy GC3 – Housing Delivery	I assume para 4.8 relates to Policy GC3? Although I agree with GC3, the projected yield of up to 15 dwellings for site RA146 on Loddington Road is unachievable.	<p>Yes, paragraph 4.8 provides the policy wording for Policy GC3.</p> <p>The housing allocation for the Loddington Road site (Policy GC4) refers to a maximum of up to 15 dwellings and furthermore the NP policy has to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, in this respect to Policy GRC2 of the Adopted Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.</p>	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Policy GC4 – Loddington Road Site	I assume para 4.11 relates to Policy GC4? In order to meet the requirements of criteria c, d and g, especially the off-road parking and turning, road safety and waste bin pickup locations, the maximum achievable yield is likely to be 6 or fewer dwellings. This discrepancy with site RA146 goes back to Policy GRC2 of the Adopted Part 2 Local Plan and the subsequent requirement for the NP to conform with the Local Plan. Errors made by KBC in the Local Plan are therefore being carried forward into the NP.	<p>Yes, paragraph 4.11 provides the policy wording for Policy GC4.</p> <p>Policy GRC2 of the Adopted Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan was found to be sound by the appointed Examiner and the policy has been subsequently adopted.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans must comply with the basic conditions set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) which includes to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the area (the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan).</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan must support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan.</p>	No further action required.

Subject	Response	Steering Group and Parish Council Response	Amendments to NHP
Policy GC5 – Local Housing Needs	I assume para 4.13 relates to Policy GC5.	Yes, paragraph 4.13 provides the policy wording for Policy GC5.	No further action required.
Policy GC10 - Biodiversity	I assume para 4.29 relates?	Yes, paragraph 4.29 provides the policy wording for Policy GC10.	No further action required.
Policy GC15 – Developer Contributions and Community Projects	Item b. In my view, including the creation of a Parish Trail (whatever that entails?) is over prescriptive for a NP and should be deleted. Also, I am not aware of any village-wide enthusiasm or even awareness for this and suspect it is the suggestion by a very small minority, possibly just one person. Items a. and c are valid though and should be adequate and sufficiently nonprescriptive for the purposes of the NP and would still permit a Parish Trail in the future if that becomes the wish of the community in the future	As detailed in the evidence to this policy (paragraph 4.42), the projects listed in Policy GC15 have derived from the outcome of public consultation carried out to date in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and should not therefore be omitted. The process of the creation of the Parish Trail will be discussed further by the Parish Council.	No further action is required.
Policy Map H – Locally Listed Buildings & Structures	Items 1 & 2 are shown the wrong way round. Bridge 1 is on Loddington Road and Bridge 2 is on Northfield Road.	Noted	Action: amend Policy Map H Actioned
Policy Map H – Part 5, B51, 51 Loddington Road	House item B51 listed because of its distinctive flat roof is currently being renovated and now has a pitched roof installed. Therefore, building B-51 should be deleted from the NP list of Locally Listed Buildings and Structures.	Noted	Action: amend B51 wording to reflect initial reason for listing and current roof status Actioned