

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan

Other Consultation Response to Version 2 - Working Party Responses – update following meeting 12 November 2015

REF	Correspondent	Key Points	Decision
A	Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)	European Union – “Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora” (“European Habitats Directive”, Article 6(3))	Look at items in red - check with Mark Hunter No action needed
B	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	European Directive 2001/42/EC ‘on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment’	No action needed
C	Environment Agency	Letter dated 11 th December 2014 SEA and HRA screening for Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Plan The Environment Agency considers that the NDP is unlikely to result in significant environmental impacts	No action needed
D	Natural England	E-mail dated 17 th December 2014 Regarding consultation prior to the draft NDP document. From the evidence so far Natural England considers it unlikely that Likely Significant Effects (LSE) would result from the NDP alone. Will confirm this if this is so when they have seen the draft NDP document	Send draft NDP (this has been sent)

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan

Other Consultation Response to Version 2 - Working Party Responses – update following meeting 12 November 2015

REF	Correspondent	Key Points	Decision
E	Environment Agency	<p>Letter dated 19th March</p> <p>The Environment Agency supplied information on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flood risk management 2. Water quality and water resources 3. Waste management 4. Land contamination and soil 	<p>No action needed</p> <p>Site S007 will need a flood assessment when they apply for planning permission - no action needed by Working Party</p>
F	Natural England	<p>E-mail dated 5th February 2015</p> <p>NE considers that in general terms the NDP appears to address the natural environment well. They particularly welcome the coverage of open space protection and the enhancement of the Right of Way Network.</p> <p>NE is satisfied that the ISE screening has considered the environmental impact of the aspirational development sites.</p> <p>NE noted that the NDP was screened under the Habitat Regulations and that none of the sites were found to impact on a European designated site.</p>	No action needed
G	Bedfordshire County Council	<p>E-mail dated 6th February 2015</p> <p>Bedfordshire County Council has no objections to make</p>	No action needed
H	Minerals and Waste Planning Authority	<p>E-mail dated 26th January 2015</p> <p>The M&WPA does not consider the draft NDP to stray into County matters</p>	No action needed
I	English Heritage	E-mail dated 23 rd February 2015	No action needed

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan

Other Consultation Response to Version 2 - Working Party Responses – update following meeting 12 November 2015

REF	Correspondent	Key Points	Decision
		English Heritage (now Historic England) have considered the plan and have no comments to make	
J	Anglian Water	E-mail 9 th March 2015 Comments on Policies H5, Ec1a, Ec1b, Ec1c, Ec1d and Ec1e	No action needed
K	Higham Ferrers Town Council	E-mail dated 25 th February 2015 Higham Ferrers Town Council is supportive of the NDP and its approach	No action needed
L	Berrys	Letter from Berrys dated 29 th January 2015 on behalf of Raymond Knight asking for changes to Working Party decisions on S006 These changes concerned phasing and housing type This site received from residents 36% Full Support and 17% Conditional Support Therefore 53% support if all the conditions are met Any changes made as per the request from Berrys on behalf of their client will result in the site not meeting 50% or above support from residents and therefore would not be included as a site for development in the current NDP Comment from Mike Burton "This is an interesting comment, especially in the context of Neighbourhood Planning (as opposed to 'local Planning) legislation. Basically, you are correct in your observations that controversial policies/proposals that run the risk of the Plan being rejected at referendum may be	No action to be taken The decisions made for this aspirational site were based on: The residents desire for phased development so the village does not have too many building projects on the go at one time that would make it unpleasant for residents and add to the traffic issues of the village The residents have made their views known on housing types needed for the village Also taken into consideration was sustainable development guidelines for the village (Refer to document 'NDP-Results/v2.0' pages 2 to 8 & 103 to 110)

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan

Other Consultation Response to Version 2 - Working Party Responses – update following meeting 12 November 2015

REF	Correspondent	Key Points	Decision
		regarded as not being reasonable alternatives. “	
M	Charles Wells	<p>Letter dated 6th March 2015 from David Russell Associates on behalf of Charles Wells</p> <p>Charles Wells object to their land being designated as a Local Green Space and an Asset of Community Value</p> <p>Comment from Mike Burton “Again, reading this specification I feel that you have given systematic consideration to representations within the context of the respondent’s comments. However, the NP group should be aware of the risk of a possible backlash if individuals feel aggrieved by a proposed site allocation/designation.”</p>	<p>No action to be taken</p> <p>The proposed LSG16 site has been the major village events venue for the last 40 years and is the only space for such events that the village has available – see page 61 and 67 of the NDP (v02)</p>
N	William Pears	<p>Letter from Parker Dann dated 9th March 2015 on behalf of William Pears (S019a & S19b)</p> <p>Aspirational site SO19a : Chelston Rise : 35 houses This site received from residents 30% Full Support and 15% Conditional Support (combined support 45%) Full Rejection 51% and 3% No Opinion Full results of the Neighbourhood Plan Poll for site SO19a Full Support 106 Conditional support 52 Full Reject 180 No opinion 12</p> <p>Aspirational site SO19b Chelston Rise 70 houses This site received from residents 4% Full Support and 3% Conditional Support (combined support 7%) Full Rejection 91% and 2% No Opinion</p>	<p>No action to be taken</p> <p>Both sites did not reach the 50% or above support from residents</p> <p>Previous planning application to ENC refused (Refer to document ‘NDP-Results/v2.0’ pages 2 to 8 & 163 to 180)</p>

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan

Other Consultation Response to Version 2 - Working Party Responses – update following meeting 12 November 2015

REF	Correspondent	Key Points	Decision
		<p>Full results of the Neighbourhood Plan Poll for site SO19b</p> <p>Support 13</p> <p>Conditional support 12</p> <p>Reject 317</p> <p>No opinion 8</p>	
O	Chelveston Renewable Energy Limited	<p>Letter dated 9th March 2015 by Savills on behalf of Chelveston Renewable Energy Limited (CRE)</p> <p>Overall CRE welcome the draft NDP but would like some amendments (S020a & S020b)</p>	<p>To be discussed further by the NDP</p> <p>(Refer to document 'NDP-Results/v2.0' pages 2 to 8 & 181 to 197)</p>
P	P.W. Mommersteeg	<p>Document submitted by Wilbraham Associates Limited on behalf of P.W. Mommersteeg (S018a & S018b)</p> <p>Document contesting designation of LSG19</p>	<p>No action to be taken</p> <p>LSG19 retained because of views to and from the church which are of high value to residents</p> <p>(Refer to document 'NDP-Results/v2.0' pages 2 to 8 & 151 to 162)</p>