

WILLOUGHBY FIRST DRAFT PLAN - CONSULTATION
Consideration of Questionnaire Responses (30 November 2018)

Policy or Section	Responses	Steering Group Consideration	Suggested Changes or Additions to NDP
Q1 Draft Vision	Yes 96.30% (104) No 3.70% (4) NA* 0.00% (0) Respondents 108 * Not Answered	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP.
Q2 Comments on Draft Vision			
1. General Support	Having never been involved in writing or preparing a plan, it appears sound to me. Very comprehensive	Noted.	No change.
2. General comments	The plan needs to consider how to selectively develop Willoughby to create a more interactive and sustainable community. Willoughby should not be an exclusive village. Slow development will not encourage local people to settle. A blinkered approach with no scope for change will be detrimental to the life of the village. The part I would question is the implication that it excludes any one who doesn't already live or have connection to the village surely we should be open to all who share our values. Insert 'primarily' between 'sustainable way to' and 'needs of local people' Not sure how you keep any new developments restrained to the use or occupation by local residents.	Noted. The NDP has to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan. The NDP is likely to be submitted shortly after the adoption of the new emerging Rugby Local Plan and so will be tested for general conformity against these policies at examination. Willoughby is a Rural Village where ' <i>Development will be permitted within existing boundaries only, including the conversion of existing buildings</i>	Amend Vision to: 'The attractive rural character of Willoughby village and the surrounding area will be retained and enhanced. Development will take place in a gradual and sustainable way to primarily meet the needs of local people who live in or have a connection to the parish.'

	<p>The village cannot be focussed just on people who already live here. The community must evolve, so the vision should include provision for attracting new residents.</p> <p>The local people part sounds a little parochial. Do we mean no 'outsiders' are welcome to join the village?</p>	<p><i>where national policy permits.'</i> (Policy GP2: Settlement Hierarchy). Therefore development for new housing will be limited over the plan period.</p> <p>The Steering Group has prepared the vision taking into account the comments and representations submitted during the consultation processes so far. There is a view that new housing should be available for local people where possible but it is accepted that new market housing cannot be limited in this way. Therefore it may be appropriate to amend the vision as suggested.</p> <p>The concern that the Vision may sound parochial has been addressed by including the word 'primarily'.</p>	
<p>3. General Comments</p>	<p>Development should be very gradual</p> <p>Add 'proportionate' between 'gradual' and 'and' line 2. This reflects back to the Inspectors comments about the settlements across the Upper Leam Valley</p> <p>Strengthen the Draft Vision to facilitate Objective 6 and actively encourage new shopping facilities in the village to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>The attractive rural character of Willoughby village and the surrounding area will be retained and enhanced ecologically and developmentally. Progress will take place</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Amend Vision as suggested to refer to supporting local services.</p> <p>The additional suggested text "ecologically and developmentally" is not considered necessary as "development" is already mentioned in the vision and "ecology" may be inferred under "rural character". Further detail</p>	<p>Amend Vision to:</p> <p>'The attractive rural character of Willoughby village and the surrounding area will be retained and enhanced. Development will take place in a gradual, proportionate and sustainable way to primarily meet the needs of local people who live in or have a connection to the parish and to support local services and facilities.'</p>

	in _____	about enhancing biodiversity is provided in Policy W4.	
Q3 Draft Objectives	Yes 97.22% (105) No 0.93% (1) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP.
Q4 Comments on Draft Objectives			
4. General Support/ Ambivalent	<p>I agree with all the objectives. Perhaps an emphasis on avoiding in filling as well. Really like the focus on community and business for the village.</p> <p>All 6 (referring to Yes answer given to Q3)</p> <p>So one should be careful only thinking about local needs meaning village. We are part of a wider community and this is equally important</p> <p>The answer is binary and therefore leave little scope to partially agree and or agree/disagree with certain objectives.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Realistically, due to the tight settlement boundary identified in the Local Plan, most development will be infilling. However hopefully the NDPs strong policies on design and character will help to protect against unacceptable densification.</p> <p>The Vision has been amended to change the emphasis on local needs.</p>	No change.
5. Ecology - Comment	I feel a further obj. around the ecology of the area should be included and change the order of objectives to reflect ecology first, conservation of landscape and village second followed by objectives re: people (recreation/services next and finally followed by present obj. 3 and 4	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The order of the objectives has been carefully considered by the steering group and is considered to represent local priorities to protect the landscape and character of Willoughby parish. The planning policies also follow this sequence of themes. Objective 1 could be amended to</p>	<p>Amend Objective 1 to:</p> <p>" Objective 1: To ensure that the rural landscape character and biodiversity of the parish is protected and enhanced.</p> <p>New development should be sustainable and should not detract from the character of the existing structures and landscape or impact adversely on local habitats and wildlife. Landscaping schemes</p>

		refer more explicitly to biodiversity objectives.	should be designed sensitively taking into account the distinctive character of the historic agricultural landscape and the surrounding countryside. (This will be progressed through NDP policies W1, W2 , W3 and W4)
6. Sewage capacity - Comment	I would like an addition to the above stating that no new development should take place until the utility services can handle the extra volume ie the inadequate capacity of the sewerage system that continually blocks at the entrance to White Barn Close.	Noted. Policy W5 should provide protection against surface water runoff which can contribute to sewers reaching capacity and flooding in extreme weather events. Local utility companies will be invited to comment at Reg 14 and if there are local capacity issues they are likely to comment and suggest how the plan should be amended, if required.	No change.
7. Affordable Housing - Comment	We need to encourage affordable housing to help young people remain in the village The needs of all people should be considered. Some development should be affordable, utilities should be developed looking at a greener future. Consideration should be given to providing more homes.	Noted. Willoughby is a Rural Village where " <i>Development will be permitted within existing boundaries only, including the conversion of existing buildings where national policy permits.</i> " (Policy GP2: Settlement Hierarchy). Therefore development for new housing in Willoughby will be limited over the plan period.	No change.

		Affordable provision can only be provided on sites of 11 or more dwellings (see Local Plan Policy H2) or as "exception" schemes under Local Plan Policy H4 which allows such schemes "adjacent to defined rural settlement boundaries". These matters are fully addressed in the emerging new Local Plan and the NDP should not duplicate policies set out in other planning documents.	
8. Homeworking/ importance of good broadband and mobile phone network Comment	<p>Could there be something about a commitment to investigate and encourage latest communication / Broadband initiatives? As someone who works from home this would be a great way to support this style of remote working.</p> <p>Without superfast broadband, it is very difficult to encourage homeworking.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is an action rather than planning policy matter and should be referred to the parish council.</p>	No change.
9. General/Other	<p>The car wash business on the A45 is a scruffy eyesore. Something to prevent aesthetically ugly messes like this?</p> <p>Objectives could include a presumption in favour of replacing current low-quality housing with better standard and more visually appealing buildings</p> <p>As per my previous comments.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP can only be used influence planning applications as and when they come forward.</p> <p>Design policies in the NDP seek to promote high quality and sustainable design in new buildings, including where housing may be replaced.</p>	No change.

Q5 Draft Policy W1 Landscape	Yes 97.22% (105) No 0.93% (1) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted	Refer to figures in NDP.
Q6 Comments on W1			
10. General Support	<p>Agree with it all!</p> <p>Point F is of particular importance to me as I feel that it's the green space separating the various settlements that make 'villages' distinct.</p> <p>Point F is of particular importance as far as I'm concerned. I feel this distinction between settlements is what makes a village a village.</p> <p>Very important that green areas/large gardens within the village boundary should be protected from development</p> <p>Nothing to add</p>	Noted.	No change.
11. Contamination / Agricultural Development Comments	<p>No development that contaminates the local character and environment should be allowed ie Pig Farms and Slaughter Houses</p> <p>I would like to recommend that any new industry that causes unacceptable smell, sound, contamination and animal cruelty should be prevented ie any Animal factory farming or slaughterhouses for Sentient Animals</p> <p>Agriculture is going through changing times, farmers have to diversify in order to survive.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy W1 protects landscape character. Proposals that require planning consent will be required to manage nuisance issues such as noise, odour, and ground / water contamination through planning and environmental health requirements and conditions.</p> <p>Agricultural uses are an important part of the rural economy. The NDP cannot limit agricultural</p>	No change.

		related uses such as slaughter houses or pig farms on the grounds of possible cruelty.	
12. Housing Comment	Use not just infill but pockets of land served by existing roads and on edge of the village	Not accepted. Refer to Q23 in Issues and Options consultation where 57.14% of respondents were not in favour of building outside the settlement boundary.	No change.
13. General Comment	Leave out 'wherever possible'. (a loop hole)	The term 'wherever possible' is frequently used in planning policies to allow for some degree of flexibility and helps to overcome concerns about policies being unduly prescriptive.	No change.
14. Comment - Ridge and Furrow	The R&F maps do not include R&F on Glebe land adjacent to the Old Vicarage, which remains largely R&F, used for pasture.	This has been checked and there is a piece of the glebe land that is R & F which was described as pasture. Maps to be amended.	Amend Maps 9 and 10
Q7 Draft Policy W2 Significant Views	Yes 98.15% (106) No 0.00% (0) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted	Refer to figures in NDP
Q8 Comments on W2			
15. General Support	Couldn't agree more. Unfortunately, we can't 'own' a view but I feel that any steps that can be taken to preserve the open aspect	Noted. Steering Group will provide new photographs for some views.	Insert new / replacement photos as provided by steering group.

	<p>surrounding the village should be protected as much as possible.</p> <p>Yes, provided this does not restrict growth of the village community</p> <p>Perhaps two or three replacement photographs now the landscape is greener?</p>		
Q9 Draft Policy W3 Renewable Energy Schemes	<p>Yes 93.52% (101)</p> <p>No 2.78% (3)</p> <p>NA 3.70% (4)</p>	Strong support noted. (Retain policy in Draft NDP.)	Refer to figures in NDP
Q10 Comments on W3			
16. General Support/ Ambivalent	<p>It is important to encourage renewable energy schemes.</p> <p>I can't disagree with the principle</p> <p>As long as not intrusive.</p> <p>Yes but think more flexibility in approach to visual impact is important as finding solutions to global warming is a priority.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Visual impacts have to be weighed against other objectives such as addressing climate change. The policy as worded requires adverse impacts to be mitigated or minimised, so schemes should address both issues.</p>	No change.
17. Visual and noise impact Objections - Wind, Solar, Noise etc	<p>For me this is a key area we do not need wind turbines of other intrusive sightings, where ever possible under ground schemes should be supported.</p> <p>Wind farms too intrusive. Solar probably not too bad.</p> <p>PV panels inappropriate</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Schemes for new onshore wind turbine development can now only be provided where there is support in terms of site allocations in development plans - see Ministerial Statement House</p>	No change.

	<p>Concerned about fields FULL of solar panels</p> <p>Providing it is not wind generation</p> <p>Other factors, such as noise, should also be a consideration.</p> <p>Remove words after "mitigated".</p>	<p>of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS42) Department for Communities and Local Government Written Statement made by: Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) on 18 June 2015. Local planning: 'suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan'.</p> <p>The NDP does not allocate a site for wind turbine development.</p> <p>However Policy W3 has been drafted to ensure that other types of low carbon energy schemes may be supported where landscape and visual impacts are properly addressed. This would include landscaping or screening where larger schemes are proposed.</p> <p>Other factors such as noise or disturbance should be addressed through conditions attached to planning consents. The words after "mitigated" should be retained to maintain flexibility.</p>	
<p>18. Clarification Requested - 'community led'</p>	<p>The statement needs clarification - what kind of initiatives and/or schemes are envisaged? What is meant by community-led (underlined)? (Is this an individual with an assertive voice? A group</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Insert definition of community led energy scheme into supporting</p>	<p>Amend 4.2.26. Delete last sentence and 2 bullet points and replace with: 'Community energy projects have</p>

	<p>(underlined), or ...?) Does the steering group have one in mind?</p> <p>Define 'community-led'</p> <p>I've ticked yes but not sure exactly what community-led means. Who takes the lead and who has the final say about a scheme going ahead?</p> <p>The whole (underlined) community should be aware of proposals</p> <p>Not sure why it has to be community-led? We should be supporting renewable + low carbon schemes regardless of who leads it. Community-led sounds like we really mean controlled.</p>	<p>text.</p> <p>An emphasis on community led schemes would help to ensure that any projects are led by local people and address local concerns and needs.</p>	<p>an emphasis on local engagement, local leadership and control and the local community benefiting collectively from the outcomes. Examples of community energy projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-owned renewable electricity installations such as solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, wind turbines or hydroelectric generation. • Members of the community jointly switching to a renewable heat source such as a heat pump or biomass boiler. • A community group supporting energy saving measures such as the installation of cavity wall or solid wall insulation. • Working in partnership with the local Distribution Network Operator (DNO) to pilot smart technologies. • Collective purchasing of heating oil for off gas-grid communities • Collective switching of electricity or gas suppliers.' <p>Retain footnote and add ,What is Community Energy?' See https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-energy#what-is-community-energy.</p>
--	---	---	---

Q11 Draft Policy W4 Green and Blue Infrastructure	Yes 98.15% (106) No 0.00% (0) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP
Q12 Comments on W4			
19. Map 3 Comment	Not sure the map clearly shows the green and blue networks. A should perhaps refer to connection to existing networks - the inter-connection is vital	Partially accepted. The green and blue infrastructure network as drawn is in proportion to the map itself. Widening the lines showing the infrastructure leaves the map looking rather cluttered and does not add to the clarity. Amend W4A to recognise the importance of connecting with existing networks wherever possible.	Amend W4A to add an additional sentence: 'New infrastructure should connect to existing infrastructure wherever possible.'
20. Maintenance of blue and green infrastructure Comments	The Environment Agency should be encouraged to dredge water courses downstream to help the water get away Footpaths in the Willoughby area are generally poorly signed and even more poorly maintained	Noted. These are not planning policy matters - refer to parish council for action.	No change.
21. Cycleways - comment	Cycleways should be developed to encourage people to leave cars at home.	Accepted. This is addressed in point C.	No change.

22. General comments	For ALL paragraphs A B C D & E, I should like to see some specificity (underlined) re. development (underlined), proposals (underlined), opportunities (underlined), mitigation measures (D) and new schemes (E)	Not accepted. NDP planning policies have to be considered as a whole and it would be inappropriate and misleading to underline some aspects only to provide an emphasis.	No change.
Q13 Draft Policy W5 Flood Risk	Yes 98.15% (106) No 0.00% (0) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted	Refer to figures in NDP
Q14 Comments on W5			
23. General Support	Definitely (referring to Yes answer in Q13)	Noted.	No change.
24. Reducing flood risk Comments	We live in a flood plain. In exceptional conditions the village will flood. Nothing will ever prevent this. The important thing is maintenance of outfall. Brook cleared. Drains cleared regularly. Any reduction in flood risk should be considered in conjunction with the capacity and limitations of the sewage system which is at capacity especially at the western end of Main Street	Noted. Maintenance is not a planning policy matter. Capacity of the network will be considered by utility companies during the Reg 14 consultation. The NDP will be amended if required following consideration of any submitted comments at that stage.	No change.
25. Pond.	Provision ought to be made for the maintenance of the water level in the Village Pond, one of our main amenities. The current level seems to be dangerously low as a habitat for local wildlife. No mention is made of this	Noted. This is not a planning policy matter. The Steering Group is aware that summer 2018 has been unusually	No change.

		dry. The water level of the pond should recover during the winter months.	
26. Correction	Item B last sentence amend 'minimise run off' to read 'minimise rate of run off'	Accepted. Amend B as suggested.	Amend Point B second sentence: 'New development should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and to minimise rate of runoff. '
Q15 Draft Policy W6 Heritage Assets	Yes 97.22% (105) No 0.00% (0) NA 2.78% (3)	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP.
Q16 Comments on W6			
27. General Support/ Ambivalent	Willoughby's heritage must be preserved for future generations. This is particularly thorough. At the Neighbourhood Plan day I was amazed to realise the diversity of homes and heritage within the village, but also how new developments can easily creep up almost Unnoticed! I do have some concerns that this is going to be used as a tool to block reasonable home extensions, and in this case I would not wish it to take precedence over nationally developed planning regulations.	Noted. The policy would not interfere with Permitted Development Rights. These are set out in national planning law and allow some development without the need for planning consent. Planning policies can only guide development where planning consent is required.	No change.
28. Corrections	The Wesleyan Chapel (shown as 12 on the map) is not in the correct place on the map. It should be further east and above the letter T on Main Street.	Accepted. Amend Map 14.	Amend Map 14.

	I think manor farm should be included in the heritage assets list if it isn't already	Manor Farm is a Listed Building - see Appendix 2.	
29. Listed Buildings	Please provide information about the listed properties in the way you have for the non-listed.	Noted. Information about Listed Buildings can be found on the Historic England website. However it might be helpful to provide the links to all Listed Buildings in Appendix 2.	Amend Appendix 2. Insert links to all Listed Buildings.
Q17 Draft Policy W7 Design	Yes 94.44% (102) No 3.70% (4) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP.
Q18 Comments on W7			
30. General Support and Enforcement	Seems very comprehensive. ...Yes, but who, OR which body (<u>underlined</u>), will actually be appointed to oversee this and ensure that the general principles outlined are enforced (<u>underlined 3 times</u>). W7 is very thorough (<u>underlined</u>)... someone has worked hard on this one!!	Noted. Planning applications are determined by the local planning authority (Rugby Borough Council) and the policies in the NDP will be used by planning officers and members to inform decisions. NDP policies have been prepared in consultation with residents and reflect advice from officers from the Borough Council.	No change.

<p>31. Clarification Requested</p>	<p>Do these principles replace current rules for permitted development without planning permission?</p> <p>I agree with this but in reality it is probably very much at odds with W8. Low cost starter homes are not usually high quality sustainable design - which takes precedence.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Planning policies can only guide development which requires planning consent. Permitted development rights will continue to apply.</p> <p>Not accepted. Good quality design does not always lead to higher construction costs and more sustainable homes can lead to savings over the longer term for occupiers for instance through lower energy and maintenance costs.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>32. Objections - Too restrictive</p>	<p>Generally ok, but some are a little bit too restrictive</p> <p>Whilst I support the majority of the proposal, some areas appear a little over prescriptive to me.</p> <p>However cost is a factor and care should be taken that the approach is not too regimented as to put people off.</p> <p>Think there's too much focus on things fitting in. Can lead to bland mediocre design. Think quality of architecture and good design is more important than being 'safe' and unoffensive.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Policy reflects local concerns about the need to protect and enhance local character but it also promotes sustainable and contemporary design where appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>33. General Comments.</p>	<p>The village could and can support additional properties that adhere to the policy. Doing nothing or simply protecting the village as is only should not be an option</p> <p>Nothing in this (?policy?) will necessarily preclude the installation of rooftop solar panels</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Solar panels on residential properties can fall under permitted development rights and so may not require planning consent.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	Any new development should not proceed until adequate sewerage facilities are provided and the narrowest part of Main St adjacent to No 5 WBC is widened ie grass verge converted to road. It is currently used as a grass road anyway!	Sewage concerns are addressed in 6. and 24. above. Refer verge issue to parish council.	
34. Affordable housing.	We do need affordable houses for local people this should be included in the draft in my view	Noted. Refer to 7. above.	No change.
35. Correction	Item J: - replace W6 with W5	Accepted.	Amend Point J. Replace W6 with W5.
Q19 Draft Policy W8	Yes 92.59% (100) No 5.56% (6) NA 1.85% (2)	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP.
Q20 Comments on W8			
36. Support	In total agreement, but see comments in 18. (Comments in 18 refer to low cost starter homes not usually being high quality, sustainable design.)	Refer to 31. above.	
37. Objections - Too restrictive	New houses should not be restricted to 1 or 2 bedrooms. There are already a substantial number of these in the village. Affordable houses should be supported and you should not be specific about how affordability is achieved. The presumption in favour of smaller housing is unnecessary, as the village already has a disproportionate amount of small ('affordable') housing, much of it low-quality. Housing should not have to demonstrate a local need - as the community must evolve, including attracting new residents. Otherwise it just becomes a retirement village.	Not accepted. The priority for more smaller homes is supported by informal consultations with local residents during the preparation of the NDP. The Rugby SHMA* 2016 considers housing need over the plan period taking into account projected population changes eg people moving, aging population,	No change to policy. Add paragraph after 4.6.8: 'The SG looked at the current housing stock in Willoughby Parish and compared this to the need identified in the Rugby SHMA. Appendix 6 shows this comparison which supports the NDP priority for smaller houses.' Amend 4.6.9 to also refer to information in Appendix 6.

	<p>We should not (underlined) only go for smaller houses. Bigger homes are for families. This keeps villages alive.</p> <p>Yes but think there is also lot of demand for larger family homes</p> <p>Additional family homes of various sizes not simply one/two offs, a well considered small development should be supported to create a larger more sustainable community</p>	<p>migration etc and economic growth. Steering group calculations (see Appendix 6) show that for 1 bedroom houses there is currently under provision compared to the SHMA*, for 2 bedrooms Willoughby is within the recommended range, for 3 bedrooms there is under provision (albeit just) and for 4+ beds there is overprovision.</p> <p>The policy does not exclude large houses but 'particularly encourages' smaller dwellings.</p> <p>*SHMA Strategic Housing Market Assessment</p>	<p>Amend reference at 4.7.1 to Appendix 8. and amend heading for current Appendix 6. Local Businesses to Appendix 8.</p>
<p>38. Affordable homes Comments.</p>	<p>Add that particular support is for development meeting housing needs identified in the most recent housing needs survey.</p> <p>Would these homes be Social Housing or Private. I think there is a need for Young Peoples Homes</p> <p>Affordable houses should be promoted for your people</p> <p>Typically, restrictions are imposed on re-selling affordable homes ie can only sell to a local person, which can prevent or delay a sale for those who have purchased these 'affordable' homes when they are ready to move on or upgrade, ie remove all (underlined) restrictions on resale to make it more tempting to purchase this type of home by younger members of the community; sometimes there is a clause which states 'it must offered for sale to a local person for 3 months, then if not sold, can be offered 'Rugby' person</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to 7. Above.</p> <p>These matters are addressed by Rugby Borough Council in planning and housing policies.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	and finally, if still not sold, only then can it be offered on the 'open market'. These restrictions do not make it a fair prospect to purchase as future moves could be delayed by months, at which point potentially lost the new property you would want to upgrade to, very disadvantageous.		
39. Keeping new homes affordable Comments.	<p>There should be a restriction on affordable housing to prevent extensions being built meaning that at the point of re sale it becomes unaffordable</p> <p>Smaller starting homes (1-2 bedrooms) Homes for young families (2-3 bedrooms) Small homes for older residents (1-2 bedrooms)</p> <p>I feel that it should be clearly stated that the above have to stay this size and remain for that use only - not be allowed to increase in size as has already happened in Willoughby and therefore remain as the stated use.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy W7 Point E guides proposals for new extensions but planning consent is not always required due to permitted development rights.</p> <p>There is some confusion here between 'affordable' housing and 'smaller' housing.</p> <p>Affordable housing can include larger, family sized housing and smaller housing can be priced at the market level.</p> <p>For a definition of affordable housing refer to NPPF Glossary - this could be added as an Appendix to the NDP.</p>	<p>Insert definition of Affordable Housing in new Appendix 7 and refer to this in Point 4 of Policy W8.</p> <p>Amend reference at 4.8.4 to Appendix 9. and amend heading for current Appendix 7. Local Facilities and Services to Appendix 9.</p>
40. Sheltered housing Comments	<p>Due to lack of amenities (shop, doctor, public transport etc.), Willoughby residents need their own car(s). Sheltered housing is not suitable for Willoughby.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>It is important to provide housing choice and some residents may prefer to remain in a community where there is an existing family / social support network.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>41. Parking Comments E.</p>	<p>Smaller and Affordable housing may be an urgent requirement however suitable parking for all must be available. We have no bus service we all need a car! E. There should be no additional on-street parking</p> <p>E. On street parking is already a major problem. New development should have all the parking it needs beside it so there is no need from any on street parking.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP cannot stop on-street car parking but E. encourages development proposals to provide sufficient on-site provision to minimise on-street parking in the village.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>42. Green space and wildlife in the village comments</p>	<p>W8 (C) in particular is important as Willoughby has a special network of green and wildlife areas within the village which are important in the context of disappearing wildlife in general in the countryside</p> <p>I feel that new buildings in back gardens will largely mean loss of openness.</p> <p>We don't need any more houses squashed into peoples gardens (more congestion)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Point C is likely to limit 'backland' development where there is demonstrable harm to local character.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>43. General/Other</p>	<p>There needs to be enough development in order that Willoughby will develop and not stagnate.</p> <p>No development should precede adequate sewerage facilities</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP supports some development in line with policies in the new emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Sewage capacity will be considered by utility companies at Reg 14.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Q21 Draft Policy W9 Home Working/ Small Businesses</p>	<p>Yes 95.37% (103) No 1.85% (2) NA 2.78% (3)</p>	<p>Strong support noted.</p>	<p>Refer to figures in NDP.</p>

Q22 Comments on W9			
<p>44. General Support/ Ambivalent</p>	<p>Can't think of any, it's very thorough</p> <p>By encouraging development of business it enables Willoughby to prosper.</p> <p>Providing they have no adverse impact on the village</p> <p>Support home working but it would depend on type of small business to support this part</p> <p>I think you've covered it but any venture which generates noise, smells, visual impact etc even on just one neighbour should have little support.</p> <p>Not industrial or using loud machinery</p> <p>Any objections from near residents should be given serious consideration.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Point C addresses residential amenity and any adverse impacts associated with development proposals.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>45. Comment.</p>	<p>C above - add 'and any other environmental contamination'</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Add additional text to the end of C as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend Point C:</p> <p>' Proposals demonstrate consideration of impact on infrastructure and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures to minimise any adverse impacts on local residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance, capacity of the road network, highway safety and odour and any other environmental contamination.'</p>

<p>46. D. Parking</p>	<p>Definitely adequate parking for visitors.</p> <p>D. Adequate off-street (underlined) parking</p> <p>D should refer to 'ample' parking</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>There is a need to balance support for small businesses with any adverse impacts. In some circumstances on-street parking may be acceptable for visitors and employees and the policy is for 'small scale' businesses. Larger scale business development may be required to provide on-site parking provision as part of planning conditions but given Willoughby is a village set within the rural area such proposals are unlikely to be acceptable in policy terms.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 5 Car Parking Standards in the new emerging Rugby Local Plan. This provides much more detail in relation to a range of uses. Planning applications will be required to address these adopted standards.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>47. E</p>	<p>E should refer to a definition of small business. Small in many SME definitions is very large in terms of Willoughby</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Criterion E goes on to link small businesses and facilities to the quiet enjoyment of the countryside. Major development as defined in the NPPF would not be acceptable in Willoughby as it is in a rural area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

48. G. Haulage/ Distribution Support	<p>I strongly agree with point G</p> <p>I support small businesses, but our small back roads cannot cope with high weight traffic eg look at Carters road surface.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
49. G. Object	<p>But I think G is too strong rather than resisted I think we should be saying very carefully scrutinised</p>	<p>Not accepted. 'Resisted' is a planning policy term which is widely used. 'Scrutinised' may still allow for support.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
50. Communication infrastructure Comment	<p>The village must push harder for greater mobile 4/5G communications and faster broadband otherwise home working is compromised.</p> <p>Again, the need for faster broadband.</p> <p>See previous comment about Communications provision</p> <p>Community based proposals to support improved infrastructure will be encouraged to benefit all, rather than just relying on individuals.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These comments are largely related to actions rather than planning policy. Refer to parish council.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
51. Appearance	<p>More consideration of aesthetic impact ie the car wash?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NDP planning policies can only be used where planning consent is required for development proposals - not existing uses.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
Q23 Draft Policy W10 Community Facilities	<p>Yes 98.15% (106) No 0.00% (0) NA 1.85% (2)</p>	<p>Strong support noted.</p>	<p>Refer to figures in NDP</p>

Q24 Comments On W10			
52. Support	I strongly agree with protecting these existing recreational facilities at all costs.	Noted.	No change.
53. Comments / Objections	<p>This is an area of concern to me, on the surface the number of facilities looks good in practise none of them are fully viable due to the demographic and size of the village.</p> <p>This seems satisfactory (underlined) but I do question the wisdom of the extension to the excellent children's playing field. Has this been justified by its use? The drainage problem was poorly conceived.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>It is important to protect local community facilities for the benefit of existing and future residents. The policy supports social aspects of sustainable development and the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>Details such as drainage can be addressed as and when proposals come forward.</p>	No change.
54. Village Pond	<p>I hope the pond will be included as it is an amenity for education and continuing interest in nature.</p> <p>Need to add 'The Pond' in Lower St</p> <p>Not sure if the pond should be included as a village facility?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This policy is for buildings and recreational facilities. However it may be appropriate to include a reference to the pond in Policy W4 D</p>	<p>Amend Policy W4 D. Add further text at end of first sentence: 'as well as the pond on Lower Street'.</p>
55. General/Other	Due to the sad state of our church maybe extra consideration should be given to it, if not on religious grounds, on historical.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The church is a Listed building</p>	No change.

		and therefore has protection in planning terms. Its continued use as a religious facility is a matter for the church authorities.	
56. General comment	Need public transport and shop for basic items Perhaps think about imposing a covenant on developers to provide a 'permanent' bus/travel service into town for those living in the village but who do not have transport or are able to Drs/hospital etc.	Noted. Unfortunately, the NDP cannot require developers to contribute to public transport but this may be addressed through CIL or developer contributions.	No change.
57. General comment	It would be good to include some form of risk assessment of a new development in terms of the use being made e.g. around the playing field where young children may at times play alone. e.g. avoiding traffic and secluded corners.	Noted. Detailed matters such as health and safety will be addressed through the development management process.	No change.
Q25 Generally Supportive of Plan	Yes 94.44% (102) No 0.00% (0) NA 5.56% (6)	Strong support noted.	Refer to figures in NDP
Q26 Comments on NDP as a whole			
58. General Support	An excellent first draft plan. Obviously a huge amount of work and progress has been made. Must be very close to the finished article. Well done. A very good job by all concerned. I feel the First Draft Plan is extremely well thought out and comprehensive. It certainly covers all of the points (and more!) that I would wish to be included in such a document.	Noted.	No change.

	<p>Carry on with the good work. A very good job you are making of it.</p> <p>Absolutely. Nothing to improve in my opinion. I would though like to thank everyone involved for creating this excellent and important N.D.P.</p> <p>I fully support the Draft Plan. Policy proposals are comprehensive and sensible.</p> <p>No really. Great job so far.</p> <p>Thank you for all the hard work you have put in.</p> <p>I am very happy with the Plan and appreciate the work that has gone into preparing it so well.</p> <p>No. Generally I think it is an excellent document and thanks should be given to all those who have put a lot of time into the document</p> <p>Big thank-you to everyone who has been working on this, it's been a fascinating read and I really appreciate all that has been done.</p> <p>I support everything our committee is doing to produce a Neighbourhood plan that will protect and enhance our village in the future</p> <p>I think you guys and Gals have done a great Job!</p> <p>A great job by the Steering Committee and an impressive document on and about Willoughby which will serve as a reference for many years to come.</p> <p>Keep a sense of village community in mind when considering any future changes. Well done to all involved in this process so far.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>I do support the first Draft Plan in the main but I do feel there should be more housing for young people. I do happen to be the oldest person in the village and therefore I feel that younger people have more right to planning ideas. (Signed)</p> <p>We are in overall agreement with the plan. Feel importance should be given to ditches in the area which are mostly badly maintained. Also public footpaths of which several are almost impassable and at least one seems to have disappeared.</p> <p>I particularly agree with extending existing footpaths - and would add re-opening ancient ones (<u>underlined</u>) so that other people can walk more often and more easily to neighbouring amenities and communities. This would greatly enhance quality of life (Signed)</p>		
<p>59. Ambivalent</p>	<p>The Draft Plan should work as long as it is not too strict in allowing future house building</p> <p>Needs to be a little more adventurous ... greater improvement can be achieved through careful thought and implementation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP is a planning policy document and encourages and supports development which contributes to improvements in Willoughby parish in a range of ways.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>60. Traffic</p>	<p>I don't read any specific reference to safe traffic movement through the village... there's a disaster waiting to happen here. 20's PLENTY - how might we achieve this (Signed).</p> <p>The narrowest part of Main St adjacent to no 5 WBC should be widened to incorporate the existing grass verge which is used as a road anyway! WELL DONE!</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Traffic management issues are not planning policy matters but such issues are addressed in other parish council activity - see link in Section 6. of the First Draft NDP.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>61. Parking</p>	<p>Street parking needs to be considered in respect of new builds as this is currently far in excess of what it should be.</p>	<p>Not accepted. NDP policies address car parking but are not permitted to include technical standards. These are provided in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>62. Public Transport</p>	<p>I feel some attempt should be made to re-instate a daily bus service to Rugby and Daventry for villagers who are no longer able to drive, or do not have transport of their own. We seem to have gone backwards on public transport - Willoughby also had a rail service at one time!!!</p> <p>There are several mentions of car parking e.g. for new businesses. Are there any opportunities to encourage improved public transport rather than assume increased car usage? A co-ordinated push from the parish.</p>	<p>Noted. This is an action rather than a planning policy matter and should be referred to the parish council.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>63. General/Other</p>	<p>It needs reading again with the purpose to omit phrases that are open to interpretation or provide loop holes for developers.</p> <p>I think it is very important for the village to have more control over extensions to properties - some have been allowed that are not in keeping with the existing building and are unsightly.</p> <p>When leaving the village at the junction to the A45 there is some planting outside the four crosses building that's going to become v. problematic. As you look right there are shrubs on the gravel that are going to seriously restrict the view of the road when turning left. We have some of the same shrubs in our garden and one is over 9ft tall. I don't know who owns the four crosses but they really need removing.</p>	<p>Noted. Planning policies are required to incorporate flexibility and avoid being unduly prescriptive. Extensions are addressed in design policies. Maintenance of shrubbery is not a planning policy matter but this could be referred to the parish council for possible action.</p>	<p>No change.</p>