

## ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION

### Moving Towards a First Draft Plan - Consideration of Questionnaire Responses (23 July 2018)

#### Questionnaires

In total, **202** paper questionnaires were distributed and **112** questionnaires were returned (54 online and 58 on paper). In addition, both Historic England and Natural England commented positively on the policy options being suggested.

#### Reports

The Steering Group has produced three reports following the Initial Consultation so that everyone is kept informed about what is happening. The reports are:

An [Issues & Options - Full Report](#) which enables everyone to see the responses to the Yes/No questions in the questionnaire and all the comments and ideas that we received. The report is available online at <https://www.willoughbyparishcouncil.org/neighbourhood-plan> under Key Documents and on paper. If you would like to read the Full Report on paper, please ask any member of the Steering Group or the Parish Council to borrow a copy.

A [Summary Report](#) of the document above which will be delivered to every household in the parish and to other stakeholders. This report enables everyone to see how people responded to the Yes/No questions in the Issues & Options questionnaire and provides information about where you can read the longer reports we have produced.

This [Responses and Revisions](#) document which includes our responses to what you have told us and revisions we may make to the consultation document to produce the First Draft Neighbourhood Plan. It is extremely important to emphasise that, at the moment, all of this is very much a work in progress. We are acquiring additional evidence and information (often in response to your comments and ideas) and this may well influence what is included in the First Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The Responses and Revisions document is available online at the Neighbourhood Plan website, again under Key Documents or, as above, please ask if you prefer to read a paper copy.

For various practical reasons, it now seems likely that the First Draft Neighbourhood Plan will be ready for consultation with you towards the end of September.

## Housing Needs

An additional mini survey was carried out between 14 - 24 June 2018 to clarify housing needs. There were nine responses. These indicated a clear individual need for 4 - 6 homes in the first five years (2 starter homes and 2 - 4 for older people), 1 home for older people in years 6 - 10 and 1 starter home in years 11 - 15. All asked for Affordable housing. This is in keeping with the 2014 housing survey and those carried out in surrounding villages.

Policy or Section	Responses	Steering Group Consideration	Suggested Changes or Additions to NDP
<b>Q1 Draft Vision</b>	I agree with this vision 94.64% 106 I disagree with this vision 2.68% 3 Not Answered 2.68% 3 <b>Respondents 112</b>	Strong support noted.	See detailed changes below.
<b>Q2 Comments</b>			
<b>Local People</b>	the needs of local people"... by -??  How do you define 'local people'?  What about people from other areas that wish to live in the parish or who have just recently moved to the area?  Reading again, perhaps "the needs of local people" is ambiguous and I feel would be better more clearly defined ie do you mean those in Willoughby only or a wider area eg Grandborough, Braunston, Barby etc	Noted - minor changes to wording suggested to improve clarity.	<b>Amend last part of Vision to:</b>  "... meets the needs of <b><u>all</u></b> local people <b><u>who live in or have a connection to the Parish.</u></b> "
<b>Young people</b>	To ensure the needs of young local village people are met.	Accepted but also important to cater for other groups - insert "all" before local people.	No further change.
<b>Character</b>	Main emphasis should be on retaining the character and appearance of the village	Accepted.  <b>Strengthen reference to local character</b>	<b>Amend first part of Vision to:</b>  <b><u>The attractive rural</u></b> character of Willoughby village and the

	<p>New houses should be in keeping with surrounding buildings and use similar materials</p> <p>I accept that some development will be necessary in the future but want this to be in keeping with the character of the village and surrounding area.</p> <p>It is very important that there is development that enhances existing features in the village.</p>		<p>surrounding area <b><u>will be retained and enhanced.</u></b></p>
<p><b>Social Sustainability</b></p>	<p>No changes means the village stagnates</p> <p>The village must become more vibrant and diverse in its demographic to sustain its self as a viable rural community</p> <p>Leave the village unchanged</p> <p>None or little very gradual development!</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Vision aims to provide a balance - to support some change to ensure the village has a sustainable future whilst ensuring such change is sensitive to local character and the built and natural environment.</p>	<p>No further change</p>
<p><b>General / Other</b></p>	<p>Sounds pretty good to me.</p> <p>The vision needs to be expressed in plain English rather than planning speak e.g. I have no idea what 'rural form' is (bench in the countryside ?).</p> <p>12 50 I'd prefer no new developments and only minor extensions or modifications to existing homes.</p> <p>I'm not sure what a gradual and sustainable way would look like</p> <p>Volume of traffic needs to be taken into consideration when developments are proposed, especially on Main Street near Lower Street</p> <p>Bus service coming through the village</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Change "gradual" to "incremental."</b></p> <p>Traffic and bus services should be referred to the PC and actions considered and reducing car use added to Policy Option 4.</p>	<p>Suggested amended Vision (complete):</p> <p>" <b><u>The attractive rural</u></b> character of Willoughby village and the surrounding area <b><u>will be retained and enhanced. Development will take place in an incremental and sustainable way to</u></b> meet the needs of <b><u>all</u></b> local people <b><u>who live in or have a connection to the Parish.</u></b>"</p> <p><b>Add references to reducing car use to Policy 4 under sustainable development section.</b></p>

<p><b>Q3</b> <b>Draft Objectives</b></p>	<p>I agree with these objectives 94.64% 106 I disagree with these objectives 2.68% 3 Not Answered 2.68% 3</p>	<p>Strong support noted.</p>	<p>See detailed changes below.</p>
<p><b>Q4</b> <b>General Support or Ambivalent</b></p>	<p>Appears to be a comprehensive list of objectives which should provide both scope and protection going forward</p> <p>Ticked</p> <p>I agree 100% with these objectives.</p> <p>It's difficult to be specific here without over-committing before feasibility has been taken into account</p> <p>N/a</p> <p>Having generally agreed with the overall objectives it does seem to be somewhat limiting without creative thought as to what the village and community could become rather than simply limiting its self to the status quo.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Steering Group have tried to be creative but this must be balanced with what a NDP can realistically address and achieve.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>
<p><b>Q4</b> <b>General Objections to Development</b></p>	<p>Too late to enforce objectives 3 and 4</p> <p>Leave the village unchanged.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP can only influence future planning decisions.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Q4</b> <b>Objective 1</b></p>	<p>Objective 1 and should not detract from the sustainability and character of the existing structures and landscape</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend Objective 1 as suggested.</p>	<p>Amend Objective 1 to: <b>Objective 1: To ensure that the rural landscape character of the parish is protected and enhanced.</b> New development should be sustainable <b>and should not detract from the character of the existing structures and landscape.</b> <b>Landscaping schemes</b> should be</p>

			designed sensitively taking into account the distinctive character of the historic agricultural landscape and the surrounding countryside.
<b>Q4 Objective 3</b>	<p>How do you define a building that ‘positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area’ ? Surely this is all subject to individual taste.</p> <p>Objective 3 - Terms such as High Quality and Sustainable design are meaningless to most people e.g high quality design can mean using very good drawing paper and documenting the drawing well further well designed developments are useless unless constructed with appropriate materials and skill e.g. My daughter bought a house a year ago in the Cotswolds with all the buzz descriptions but has recently discovered that the reconstituted stone window sills are actually concreted painted with a stone coloured finish.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy 4 will provide more detail about how high quality design can be achieved.</p> <p>Developers often argue that cost is an issue but often better quality development can be achieved for a similar cost to insensitive, poor quality schemes that do not respond properly to the local context.</p>	No change.
<b>Q4 Objective 4</b>	<p>Objective 4 - suggest dwellings for the elderly freeing up homes for families</p> <p>Historically most houses in the village have been bought by ‘outsiders’ - as time elapses they become locals.</p> <p>Feel more could be included to look at needs of Willoughby residents to encourage the younger generation to settle i.e. Affordable housing and facilities</p> <p>To include a provision for affordable homes</p> <p>Local housing needs is a very important issue.</p> <p>There has to be a happy medium for any new housing developments to be in keeping with the area and of high</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Refer to Policy 5.</p> <p>Some limited additional housing in the village would help to sustain local services.</p>	<p>Include reference to the following in <b>Policy 5:</b></p> <p><b><u>- starter homes for young people</u></b>  <b><u>- downsizing for older existing residents</u></b>  <b><u>- affordability</u></b></p> <p><b>Add to supporting text to Policy 5 (e.g. to 4.6.12):</b>  <b><u>Some limited additional housing in the village would help to sustain local services.</u></b></p>

	<p>quality, but also affordable, as it's difficult for young people to afford housing in rural areas.</p> <p>With regards to new housing, should there be mention of it being sustainable in the sense of resources in the wider area, not just Willoughby, ie the impact any new housing here would have on doctors surgeries, schools, parking, etc in Rugby or Daventry? Or is this not relevant at the Willoughby NDP level?</p>		
<p><b>Q4 Objective 5</b></p>	<p>Farming needs may mean that changes to the rural landscape need to be taken into consideration, to support their business.</p> <p>I would prefer small businesses not micro businesses. What's the difference?</p> <p>I hope fibre optic to the cabinet has and will continue to assist those with businesses/working from home.</p> <p>The nature, size and location of any new business should not be such as to effect the health and welfare of village residents. Willoughby needs a mobile phone capability to encourage small businesses and other residents.</p> <p>Internet network should be as efficient as possible to encourage business</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Refer to changes in the rural economy and small businesses in Objective 5.</p> <p>Refer to need to protect residential amenity.</p> <p>The steering group discussed internet provision in some detail as this is a significant issue. Emerging Local Plan Policy SDC 9: Broadband and mobile internet provides an existing detailed planning policy which requires new development to incorporate suitable facilities where possible and viable. There is little, if anything, an NDP policy could add to this.</p> <p>Possible improvements to the mobile phone network will be investigated.</p>	<p>Amend Objective 5 to:</p> <p><b>Objective 5: To support home working and <u>small businesses</u>.</b></p> <p>New businesses in the parish will be supported to help ensure Willoughby develops and prospers. New businesses should be suitable for the countryside location <b><u>and minimise any adverse impacts on local residential amenity. New businesses which enable agricultural diversification and rural enterprise generally will be supported.</u></b></p> <p><b>Cross reference policy on local enterprise (Planning Policy Option 6) to Policy 1 - Landscape Character and Views .</b></p>

<p><b>Q4 Objective 6</b></p>	<p>With reference to objective 6, a specific area of concern is the provision (or current lack of) a more regular bus service</p> <p>Objective 6 any development impacting community facilities must not increase the risk of criminal or anti-social behaviour e.g. creating a car park on part of the playing field hidden behind the village hall would increase the risk of potential offenders loitering unseen as well as physical risks from moving vehicles.</p> <p>It would also be good to have a general store in the village again</p> <p>Refer to how amenities should be encouraged e.g. shops, buses, etc.</p> <p>The grass verge between no. 5 White Barn Close and "Sanantone" on Main Street should be converted into a hard path to enable parking and traffic flow at the narrowest part of Main Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Issues such as lack of bus service and need for village shop cannot be addressed through the NDP but could be referred by the PC to Rugby Borough Council and other relevant bodies.</p> <p>Issues around the provision of a new car park should be dealt with at the planning application stage e.g. through landscaping, siting, design and access.</p> <p>Policies protect the grass verges as important local landscape features.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Q5 Policy Option 1 Landscape</b></p>	<p>Yes 91.96% 103 No 5.36% 6 Not Answered 2.68% 3</p>	<p>Strong support noted.</p>	<p>See detailed changes below.</p>
<p><b>Q6 General Support / Ambivalent</b></p>	<p>I think it covers everything</p> <p>This is very important - our landscape, character and views are of the utmost importance.</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Strongly agree, it is important to keep Willoughby beautiful and a village to be proud of.</p> <p>N/a</p> <p>Yes but not to the detriment of progress</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p><b>Q6 More Flexibility</b></p>	<p>There should be room for flexibility in all objectives in order to understand the needs of individuals. New and old.</p> <p>The policy needs to be more loose than the above suggested instances so as not to completely stifle new development. A, B and C have a good intention but would alienate anyone trying to build in the area when it may benefit the village.</p>	<p>Noted and partially accepted.</p> <p>Flexibility has been built into B and C by including the words 'where possible'. If a new development proposal does not meet these criteria and any departure from them can be clearly justified then the proposal will be decided on its merits.</p> <p>When the policy wording is prepared in the Draft Plan, more flexibility could be built into criteria using such words as "where appropriate" or "where possible". However this will have to be balanced against the need to be clear and concise.</p>	<p><b>When preparing Draft Plan policies consider the need for increased flexibility in some criteria.</b></p>
<p><b>Q6 Less Flexibility / Stronger wording</b></p>	<p>Leave the village unchanged.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP has to promote sustainable development and provide a positive planning framework which supports some change appropriate to the village's position in the settlement hierarchy of the Local Plan and its location in the rural area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Q6 A</b></p>	<p><b>A / B</b></p> <p>Re. A. ..These are already springing up. e.g. Shepherd's Barn... and there's also one along the A45 perhaps outside our boundary. But "within B" they are OK! !</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Development would be considered against all criteria in the policy and against other policies in the NDP.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



<p><b>Q6 B</b></p>	<p>Farming businesses surround the village, which gives the village its landscape. Businesses need to survive, which may need buildings and changes to continue in business. Changes to landscape may have to happen.</p> <p>Rural businesses will become unsustainable if they are forced to adhere to such strict regulations - they must have the freedom to be innovative and evolve, so as to ensure sustainability and provide opportunities for local jobs. The character of the village is significantly enhanced by local enterprises - we are not merely a commuter village - we must not stifle businesses' otherwise that is what we'll become!</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Policy 6 supports investment in the rural economy and will be strengthened in the draft plan to refer to agricultural diversification.</p> <p>However there is a need to balance growth and development against the need to protect the local landscape and natural heritage assets in line with the principles of sustainable development. This policy will aim to guide new development so that appropriate development can take place provided that it is sensitive to the high quality rural setting of the parish. In the long term a high quality environment can attract growth in new rural businesses such as tourism and professional services in converted former farm buildings.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Q6 D</b></p>	<p>The policy should reference the established national importance of the remaining ridge and furrow landscape and direct development not to detract from it - including where appropriate the pasture/arable fields of the enclosure layout. Preserving an R &amp; F field and surrounding it with houses or warehouses would severely limit its value.</p> <p>Any (underlined) development large or small should be prohibited from discharging any more water into the existing water course. Flood risk assessment should be a priority with any proposed developments.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>D refers to ridge and furrow but more information in supporting text is required.</p> <p>Refer comment about water courses to Policy 4.</p>	<p><b>Add further supporting text to 4.2.4. eg</b></p> <p><b><u>" the remaining areas of ridge and furrow landscape are of national importance and should be protected from development, as should the pasture/arable fields of the former enclosures. The setting of these heritage assets is also significant and if development surrounds and encloses these areas, their value would be significantly limited."</u></b></p>

			<p>Map these areas and insert map.</p> <p>Add additional criterion to Policy 1 specifically on historic landscapes e..g</p> <p><u>"the remaining areas of ridge and furrow landscape and pasture / arable fields of former enclosures as identified on map X are of national importance and development which impacts adversely on these areas and their setting will be resisted."</u></p> <p>Refer comment about water courses to Policy 4.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to a separate policy on Flood Risk</p>
<p><b>Q6</b> <b>E</b></p>	<p>Protecting the local landscape and character is one thing, but protecting views seems to go too far. Surely Willoughby NDP is only limited to Willoughby, it cannot decide/control what should or should not happen in neighbouring villages just because it can be seen from Willoughby?</p> <p>E. Can views be protected? Would 'preservation' be better than 'protection' or some other word? 'to take into consideration' should be stronger. A developer could show they have 'considered' a view by doing the studies. Then, no matter how damaging the studies show the impact to be, the developer could just carry on with the original proposal. Could this be strengthened perhaps with something like 'Where adverse impacts are identified, development proposals should be adapted/changed to mitigate the impact to the greatest possible extent.'?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NDPs can identify significant views for protection and require development to be sited and designed appropriately.</p> <p>Protect local amenity should be addressed in policies 5 and 6.</p>	<p><b>Policy 1 (or other policy specifically related to views) should be worded appropriately.</b></p> <p><b>The wording could be something like:</b></p> <p><b><u>"The identified Significant Views on Map X make an important contribution towards local visual amenity and the neighbourhood area's landscape character.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Development proposals should respect these Significant Views which are locally valued. Where a development proposal impacts on an</u></b></p>

			<p><b><u>identified Significant View, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or similar study should be carried out to ensure that the scheme is designed and sited sensitively and appropriately to mitigate any adverse impacts."</u></b></p> <p>Consider separate policy on Significant Views</p> <p>Address residential amenity in policies 5 and 6.</p>
<p><b>Q6 F</b></p>	<p>Strong emphasis on F</p> <p>Protection of all boundaries is important. Lodge farm has been the most recent one not threats could come from any area around the village.</p> <p>Make sure Onley is not of Willoughby</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Willoughby is a small village and, although limited growth will be encouraged, the countryside around it should be protected to prevent any future developments impacting on its character.</p> <p>The policy aims to protect Willoughby from merging with other settlements.</p>	<p>The wording could be something like</p> <p><b><u>F. Protecting the green gaps between Willoughby Village and all other hamlets and villages (existing or proposed) to prevent coalescence of settlements and to ensure that the village remains distinct.</u></b></p> <p>Add to the supporting text:</p> <p><b><u>If the Lodge Farm Village allocation is reinstated in the future, the green gap between the southern boundary of Lodge Farm Village (2016 Allocation) and Willoughby village should be protected.</u></b></p>
<p><b>Q6 G</b></p>	<p>See my comments about the grass verge adjacent to no. 5 WBC in question 1D to improve traffic flow and parking.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The grass verges are an important green feature of the village and</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>Grass verges whilst they are an asset it may be argued that creating car parking space in some places may be more desirable e.g. in Main St in front of the Rose &amp; Lower Street near the allotments.</p> <p>Ensure agreed landscaping schemes are planted and maintained.</p>	<p>should be protected. They form part of the green infrastructure network and play a role in reducing runoff of rainwater.</p> <p>The NDP cannot enforce planning obligations; this is a matter for Rugby Borough Council through the development management process.</p>	
<b>Q6 Other</b>	In addition to views, noise and smells from any proposed developments should also be considered.	<b><u>Refer to Policy 4</u></b>	<b><u>Refer to Policy 4</u></b>
<b>Q7 Views towards Barby</b>	<p>1 2.68% 3</p> <p>2 2.68% 3</p> <p>3 9.82% 11</p> <p>4 23.21% 26</p> <p>5 55.36% 62</p> <p>Not Answered 6.25% 7</p>	Strong support noted.	<b>Include view in policy.</b>
<b>Q8 Views to Braunston and Dunchurch</b>	<p>1 0.89% 1</p> <p>2 5.36% 6</p> <p>3 16.07% 18</p> <p>4 17.86% 20</p> <p>5 54.46% 61</p> <p>Not Answered 5.36% 6</p>	Strong support noted.	<b>Include view in policy.</b>
<b>Q9 View down to the village from Longdown Lane and from Wooldcott Road</b>	<p>1 0.00% 0</p> <p>2 3.57% 4</p> <p>3 8.04% 9</p> <p>4 13.39% 15</p> <p>5 70.54% 79</p> <p>Not Answered 4.46% 5</p>	Strong support noted.	<b>Include view in policy.</b>
<b>Q10 Views towards Wooldcott and Grandborough</b>	<p>1 0.89% 1</p> <p>2 3.57% 4</p> <p>3 8.04% 9</p> <p>4 15.18% 17</p> <p>5 67.86% 76</p> <p>Not Answered 4.46% 5</p>	Strong support noted.	<b>Include view in policy.</b>

	Note re. point 10 above (Woolscot and Grandborough "from where" (underlined)? See 3B		
<b>Q11 Other Suggested Views</b>			
<b>Church / Moor Lane</b>	<p>From Moor Lane to the Church. Towards the Church. Open character towards the church from moor lane Lower Street and Moor Lane towards the church Lower Street and Moor Lane towards church Church (towards) The views towards St. Nicholas Church from Moor Lane. From the church tower (underlined) This is amazing (underlined) and we should aim to keep it so. Willoughby house across to Braunston church and Wolfhampcote. View of floodlit church - but spoilt by overgrown fir trees</p>	Steering group to consider these and determine whether any should be incorporated into NDP.	Steering group to provide wording identifying and justifying all views for protection.
<b>Main Street</b>	View along Main Street when approaching from Moor Lane.		
<b>Sawbridge / Moor Lane / Flecknoe</b>	<p>Road towards Sawbridge The agricultural nature of the grassland field between the village and Sawbridge are both traditional and unique and should be protected Moor Lane to Sawbridge. The views either side of Moor Lane and beyond The views down Moor Lane hedges to the fields, the trees in the hedgerows The views towards Willoughby House and Sawbridge. Views towards Flecknoe Towards Sawbridge and Flecknoe Views towards Sawbridge and Flecknoe from College Road and Main Street</p>		

	The views towards Flecknoe and Shuckburgh Park from Moor Lane Flecknoe to Willoughby Towards Sawbridge and Wolfhampcote		
<b>Pond and Brook</b>	Village pond (towards) General view of village duck pond View of the village and pond when approaching from the Briccle Village brook (towards)		
<b>A45</b>	The entry into the village from both Daventry and Dunchurch ie our bit of the A45 (litter there and up Longdown is a definite problem/eyesore) The view towards the village coming onto the A45 slip road from the M45 The view to Willoughby from the A45 (five in a circle)		
<b>Leam Valley</b>	The views south towards the Leam Valley and beyond. The view to Daventry is also important with ever increasing warehousing and lightening blotting the further reaching landscape.		
<b>Canal</b>	Those from the canal and footpaths		
<b>Other</b>	Village Pub (towards) From my house N.a Views towards village from fox covet Views towards village from Onley direction I understand that no one owns a view but all should be protected wherever possible. All views are important- this doesn't mean new developments will be detrimental.		

<p><b>Q12</b> <b>Community-led renewable energy schemes</b></p>	<p>Yes 44.64% 50 No 46.43% 52 Not Answered 8.93% 10</p>	<p><b>Mixed response so not strong support.</b></p> <p>Discussion led to view that many people may be unaware of the pros and cons of such schemes. The main disadvantage may be the difficulty in screening something like a solar farm in our landscape in both summer and winter.</p>	<p><b>Draft policy and supporting text, with clear reference to importance of Policy 1, for First Draft NDP to find out if the Yes/No percentages change to be more definite in the light of additional information.</b></p>
	<p>Re. solar panels "inappropriate. Owners can have their own solar panels in the roof - this is unobtrusive"</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>To include more examples of sustainable design in Policy 4.</p>	<p><b>Add further wording re: examples to Policy 4 under Sustainable Development</b></p>
<p><b>Q13</b> <b>Green Infrastructure Networks</b></p>	<p>Yes 92.86% 104 No 2.68% 3 Not Answered 4.46% 5</p>	<p>Strong support noted.</p>	<p><b>Include policy in NDP.</b></p>
<p><b>Q14</b> <b>General Support</b></p>	<p>Agree with all of these points, particularly prevention of flooding and extension to cycle ways and footpaths.</p> <p>Ticked</p> <p>Take each case into consideration carefully.</p> <p>Leave the village unchanged</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP has to provide a positive planning framework to guide future development.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><b>Q14</b> <b>Biodiversity</b></p>	<p>I have already commented on GI via email. There needs to be care that 'new' does not introduce species that are not historically local since the impact cannot be quantified or reversed. The aim should be to facilitate species that have been indigenous to the area. There should be some consideration of the interconnection with adjoining parishes so as not to damage their ecosystems.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Insert additional text into policy.</p> <p>A GI map has been prepared showing networks in the parish and links to neighbouring parishes.</p>	<p><b>Add further wording to policy 2 eg:</b></p> <p><b><u>"New planting and landscaping schemes should use locally appropriate species which contribute to biodiversity and wildlife objectives"</u></b></p>

		All network items identified below are included in the map except trees and Local Green Spaces (LGSs) / other green spaces. These will be added when LGSs have been agreed by the SG.	<b><u>"Green Infrastructure Networks should link to networks in neighbouring parishes wherever possible."</u></b>
<b>Q14 Pond / Watercourses</b>	<p>Presumably protection of the village pond including its water level (underlined) is included. But could it border on the road give better protection for its inhabitants (underlined) ?!</p> <p>The policy towards flood risk and water quality management is particularly important. It has not been so far committed to with any great effect.</p> <p>Whatever is required to reduce flood risk should be done. it may be necessary to use expert advice in the future.</p> <p>The green infrastructure should include the whole of Longdown Lane. Drainage is a problem particularly when there is heavy rain as the water drains off the road into the Navigation complex of the Cottage, Bungalow and House and into the canal, particularly given the amount of traffic going up and down the lane, including heavy vehicles it notwithstanding the 7.5T limit which is frequently ignored.</p> <p>Flooding issues are tricky. We must remember that Willoughby will flood following spells of heavy rain however regular maintenance is required.</p> <p>WCC should clean out the brook more often beside Moor Lane.</p> <p>Please refer to separate documentation relating to Flood Risk which was requested by Maggie Beech at recent Neighbourhood Plan Day.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Consider additional policy on reducing flood risk.</p>	<b>Include additional policy on reducing flood risk referring to local information and knowledge.</b>
<b>Q14 Footpaths</b>	The upkeep of the local footpaths and their "marking" appears poor. The "new" bridleway to Braunston being an exception	Steering group to check suggestions are covered in GI map p15 and	<b>Consider and amend Map 2 if required.</b>



	<p>There should be improved cycle networks in order to protect both cyclist and motorist</p> <p>Footpaths should be accessible and maintained. Grass verges should not (underlined) be cut back too vigorously - encouraging wild-life habitat.</p> <p>Make people more aware of footpaths in and around the village with better signs or map.</p> <p>The footpath to Dunchurch should incorporate a cycle path.</p> <p>Are people happy to have footpaths across their back gardens? Should livestock be stressed and their health put a risk unnecessarily for people's leisure pursuits?</p> <p>I would really like to see the Great Central Railway Line cycleway extended from the Onley Lane through to Willoughby, especially now Dunchurch Pools has opened.</p> <p>Once agreed, a regular monitoring and maintenance programme should be introduced to enforce adherence to the policy Page 18</p> <p>See Q2B response please</p> <p>Measures if possible to keep litter dropping under control. Discourage HGVs passing through</p>	<p>consider whether network requires extensions / new routes.</p> <p>Maintenance of footpaths and verges and traffic management are outside the scope of the NDP and comments should be referred to the PC and Rugby Borough Council.</p>	
<p><b>Q15 Important Features</b></p>	<p>Wholeheartedly agree with linking green corridors with neighbouring villages thus keeping cars away from village</p> <p>Whole heartedly agree with linking green corridors with neighbouring villages keeping car volume away from the villages</p> <p>Leave the village unchanged</p> <p>Open up old railway course from A45</p>	<p>Steering group to check these are included in map.</p>	<p><b>Review Map 2</b></p> <p><b>Identify different networks in key eg trees, footpaths, bridleways, railway, streams/rivers, ponds.</b></p>

	<p>The disused railway.  Access and clarity of access to our FP network could be much improved  More cyclepaths to encourage families to get out without using a car  Improved cycleways (especially along A45).</p> <p>Prevent farmers from ploughing up footpaths  Better footpaths and cycle paths via farmland maintained by local volunteer groups  We must have a map of all the existing public footpaths and protect access  All the footpaths.</p> <p>Ridge and furrow fields?  Natural ditches, water ways and the village pond should be maintained and protected.  Re-instating of the pond in Haywards Lodge - to be used as a "holding pond" in times of potential flooding</p> <p>All the roads in the parish - all have hedges, verges and ditches facilitating the movement of wildlife.  All the local orchards and ponds.  The Fox Cover.  The covert by Willoughby House  The ancient trees including one adjacent to Gate Farm that was favoured by a particular species of butterfly.  The trees down Bricksh.  Wild flower meadows?  CRICK CLUB GROUNDS  Cricket club grounds  Sorry don't know  See answer to question 14.</p>		
<b>Q16</b> <b>Heritage Assets</b>	Yes 87.50% 98 No 5.36% 6 Not Answered 7.14% 8	Strong support noted.	Include policy in NDP.

<p><b>Q17</b> <b>Suggestions for improvements</b></p>			
<p><b>Q17</b> <b>General Support / Ambivalent</b></p>	<p>None I can think of - it's very comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes and no (to a degree). However there are a lot of new products coming on the market that could enhance and blend in. No change is not always a good thing</p> <p>Please take every case in question into careful consideration. Do not dictate.</p> <p>Any new developments should be in keeping with existing structures</p> <p>Once approved the application should be revisited on completion to ensure adherence has been met.</p> <p>The most significant heritage asset is the non-designated R &amp; F landscape this should be enshrined in the policy to avoid a debate about its importance with every maverick developer.</p> <p>New developments (limited) should not be in close proximity to the village's historical listed buildings</p> <p>Designs for developments will be required to demonstrate that they do not detract from heritage assets or their settings.</p> <p>Without clarity as to what the heritage assets are it will be very difficult satisfy.</p> <p>Leave the village unchanged</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Ridge and furrow is addressed in landscape policy.</p> <p>Setting is protected in A and C.</p> <p>Heritage assets include listed buildings which will be included in an appendix / background document, archaeological assets and any non-designated heritage assets (e.g. those on a local list) which may be identified by local residents and the PC for consideration by Rugby Borough Council. The NDP group will look at possible candidate buildings and structures in more detail as part of the preparation of the NDP.</p>	<p><b>Amend policy 3 but avoid duplication.</b></p> <p><b>Delete ... 'and, where possible, enhance' ... In B and C to make the policy clearer.</b></p> <p><b>The Policy wording will be carefully reviewed and amended to improve clarity and succinctness. All policy wording will be considered by Rugby Borough Council and Historic England during the preparation of the NDP.</b></p>
<p><b>Too Restrictive</b></p>	<p>Every proposal should be assessed individually for its merits. Many architecture splendors may never have been built under such constraints.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The policy option was supported by most respondents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>The question is too restrictive, of course protecting heritage assets is important but again not to the detriment of progress or developing a more sustainable and progressive community</p> <p>I think it makes sense for any new developments to fit in with their surroundings, but I don't think this policy is necessary as there is a wide variety of building styles in the village and that doesn't take away from its beauty.</p> <p>The council just use it as an excuse to force you to employ their archaeologists to watch you dig foundations!</p>	<p>Policy 4 encourages contemporary and sustainable designs.</p>	
<b>More Restrictive</b>	<p>Properties should have stricter planning and should be in keeping with other properties</p> <p>Enhance' a listed building is asking for architects to come up with schemes they consider enhance which may be ultra modern supposedly compatible structures. Perhaps: development to or impacting a listed structure should preserve its visual appearance in relation to existing surrounding structures and be carried out using methods compatible with preserving the listed features.</p> <p>Given that no systematic archaeological surveys have been carried out it might be desirable to require a geophysical survey of any site of more than say 3sq m. so that any remains etc. may be considered before development plans are brought forward.</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Enhancing heritage assets is included in the NPPF and is an accepted planning policy requirement.</p> <p>Insert further wording to policy to protect archaeology.</p> <p>Data, maps and a summary report have been received from Warwickshire HER to provide background information and detail for policies.</p>	<p>Insert further wording to policy to protect archaeology eg:</p> <p><b><u>"Development proposals in areas on maps in the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record (HER) for Willoughby Parish, must take account of known surface and subsurface archaeology and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development. In all instances the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record should be consulted at an early stage in the formulation of proposals."</u></b></p>
<b>Modern Design</b>	<p>The policy should include a presumption in favour of replacement of existing low-quality housing (mainly 20th century) by better quality buildings that are more sympathetic to the village environment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This could be controversial. The NDP policies already support high quality design in new development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Q18 Suggestions for Local List</b>	<p>Listed buildings</p> <p>Village support for any restoration to keep listed buildings standing.</p>	<p>Listed buildings already protected. Other suggestions not specific.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>General</b>	<p>Not left to become ruins</p> <p>The older buildings form the character of village, although mainly not used for they original purpose it is still important to maintain.</p> <p>No</p>		
<b>Ridge and Furrow</b>	<p>Ridge and furrow.</p> <p>Open Field System Ridge and Furrows which surround Willoughby and neighbouring parishes and create a uniquely contiguous landscape.</p>	These will be protected under landscape and GI policies.	No change
<b>Church</b>	<p>Church. Needs to be maintained in good condition. Integral part of any village.</p> <p>There is a need for kitchen and toilet facilities at St. Nicholas Church thereby making this heritage building more "user friendly" for the village families.</p> <p>Priority should be given to historic buildings and in particular the church should have toilet facilities if it is going to remain as an important (useable) asset for the community</p> <p>Church</p>	<p>The church is a statutory listed building - see Appendix I.</p> <p>Investment in community facilities is supported in policy 7.</p>	No change.
<b>The small cottage up Moor Lanes</b>	<p>The small cottage up Moor Lane by the History of the special water of the village</p>	Bath Cottage - is being demolished and a new house built.	Not included.
<b>Moat</b>	<p>The Moat (underlined) -- can anybody actually see this? it's hardly a noticeable feature.</p>	This is a scheduled monument and already has protection.	No change.
<b>Four Crosses</b>	<p>The Four Crosses as its history as a pub.</p>	Steering group - identify and consider	Steering group - identify and consider as possible candidate.
<b>Gate Farm</b>	<p>Gate Farm due to its age.</p>	Steering group - identify and consider	Steering group - identify and consider as possible candidate.

<b>Rose PH</b>	Encourage more social use of the Rose make it more of a "Village Pub".	This is a Listed Building.  Investment in community facilities is supported in policy 7.	No change.
<b>Hayward Lodge</b>	Hayward Lodge - bequeathed and intermittently supported over the years by Villagers and/or Village groups.	This area would be better protected as a Local Green Space.	<b>Agreed to designate and protect this as a Local Green Space.</b>
<b>Q19 High Quality Design</b>	Yes 92.86% 104 No 4.46% 5 Not Answered 2.68% 3	Strong support noted.	<b>Include policy in NDP.</b>
<b>Q20 How improved - General</b>	None - it's very comprehensive  I think the above are good guidelines and it is a shame they have not been enforced before  Providing this is not too limiting...  Include a provision for affordable homes to encourage families and lower earners  Support for smaller new developments in the village to attract younger families and to keep younger families who have grown up in the village, in the village  Leave the village unchanged	Noted.  Comments about house types and sizes should be referred to policy 5.	No change.
<b>Too restrictive</b>	The local council already has many restrictions that have to be adhered to anyway. We are already much more environmentally involved  This is overly prescriptive and restricts innovation and new design as contrast can be sympathetic to ensuring integrity of buildings.  Each proposal should be assessed on its individual merits - opportunities could be lost to enhance the aesthetics of the village. Should we be this insular?	The policy was supported by the majority of respondents.	No change.

<b>A</b>	<p>It is critical to preserve the character of the village - limited development should be sympathetic to existing structures</p> <p>High quality design should be sympathetic to its surroundings.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These matters are largely covered in the existing criteria.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>D</b>	<p>D. Extensions should not necessarily be small but in keeping with the building.</p> <p>The scale of an extension should be proportionate to the site and surrounding buildings. Permitted development rights would allow most small development without a planning application so as written this part is not useful.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Extensions which are out of proportion with existing buildings can have an adverse impact on local character and on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The Village Design Statement demonstrates that residents supported extensions to existing buildings which are sympathetic in scale, height and design.</p>	<p><b>D. could be amended to something like:</b></p> <p><b><u>Older buildings should be retained and altered in a similar style to that existing and not detract from the existing style. Extensions should be sympathetic in design to the main building and be proportionate in terms of scale and height.</u></b></p>
<b>E</b>	<p>Houses could have water storage systems? Solar panels and ground source heating where appropriate should be encouraged?</p> <p>Any solar panels fitted to roofs should not (underlined) be visible from the road.</p> <p>Regarding energy a direction that roof ridges should wherever possible be east-west maximising opportunities for solar panels. Large scale wind turbines should be vetoed as should solar farms which are not screened in a manner that prevents them detracting from the landscape.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy could include references to solar heating / hot water systems and the need for sensitive siting and design.</p> <p>Wind turbines are no longer supported in national planning policy unless there is a site allocation in a local plan or neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p><b>Insert further wording into E:</b></p> <p><b><u>Where planning consent is required, small scale domestic renewable energy schemes such as solar panels and solar water heating will be supported provided that schemes are sited and designed unobtrusively.</u></b></p>
<b>F</b>	<p>I am not sure that "contemporary designs and modern architectural approaches" sits with well with the general character of this rural area</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The policy aims to provide some flexibility and some respondents support contemporary designs.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>G</b>	Any development should not be in the front gardens and open aspects of the streets should be maintained.  Planting of trees on the front of properties should not be allowed.	G protects front gardens.  The NDP cannot stop people planting trees in gardens.	No change.
<b>I</b>	Given directive on mass and height a 2 storey limit is inappropriate and could prevent a small block of flats/maisonettes three storeys with a shallow roof pitch might well be a similar height to two storeys of high rooms and steep roof pitch.	Not accepted.  The height limit comes from the village design statement which suggests development should complement existing/adjacent properties.	No change.
<b>J</b>	Not J. People want bigger windows now to let light in - Just because a window is at the moment small people should be able to enlarge	Partially accepted.  Installing large picture windows can erode local character but it may be acceptable to have windows larger than the original where these cannot be seen from the road.	<b>Add wording to J.</b>  Windows should be appropriate to the type and size of house and alterations to older properties should retain the size and style of the original opening wherever possible. <b><u>Larger windows may be acceptable if they do not detract from the original building design and are not visible from the road.</u></b>
<b>M</b>	No objection to converting redundant farm into dwellings. Good way to provide "affordable housing"	Noted.	No change.
<b>Q22 Policy for New Homes</b>	Yes 88.39% 99 No 4.46% 5 Not Answered 7.14% 8	Strong support noted.	<b>Include policy in NDP.</b>
<b>Q23 How could be improved General</b>	This is important that any development does not adversely impact upon the existing green and open spaces within the village boundary.  Need to improve aesthetic nature of the village	Noted.  These issues are largely addressed elsewhere in other policies in the NDP.	No change.



	<p>Yes and no. Willoughby needs more than 1-2 houses to develop as a community but not just luxury housing which would prevent young first time buyers or families moving into the village</p> <p>(referring to q7C) "BUT LIMITED. If each village had an extra 8-12 houses, there would be no need for massive developments and the village character would be kept."</p> <p>See 23 below (settlement boundary) "yes, if small scale eg small group of homes"</p> <p>Proposal for developments need to be considered on an individual basis. Small scale developments are often unviable, and cannot contribute to road infrastructure improvements and other village amenities, that we could all benefit from.</p> <p>We need to stick policy -- no exceptions.</p> <p>"guide" is a weak term - "steer" or "influence" are verbs which would be more in keeping with the objectives of the Plan</p>		
<b>A</b>	5 21 A. is too restrictive	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Small scale schemes are supported by many residents.</p>	No change.
<b>C</b>	<p>Back garden development should be actively discouraged - this leads to disquiet amongst neighbours and puts additional strain on accesses and parking</p> <p>The direction re homes in back gardens needs to also ensure that such development complements surrounding properties and does not impact the street scene.</p> <p>Residential development in back gardens should not be promoted in this policy. Such developments inevitably transform an area so that it becomes more built-up/urbanised. Neighbours' privacy and tranquillity are usually negatively impacted as well. Most people living in Willoughby have a view of the countryside from their</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Review C - include reference to street scene and privacy / amenity.</p>	<b>Include reference to protecting local amenity and privacy in C.</b>

	<p>garden. This is likely to be important to their enjoyment of living in the village and to their mental health.</p> <p>Not sure what is meant by "density of built form" in C</p>		
<b>None or limited development</b>	<p>Leave the village unchanged</p> <p>Criteria should be - no new homes!</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP has to promote sustainable development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>House Types and Sizes</b>	<p>1)The only housing needed is a few starter homes (6-8) with 2 bedrooms. These need to stay as starter homes e.g. no extensions allowed and property price restricted to 2/3% per year.</p> <p>2) bungalows (4-6) for pensioners that could be used to move existing single occupants into, thus would free there larger properties for other families.</p> <p>Support development for smaller houses in the village to keep existing young families and attract new young families into the village</p> <p>Our village has a full range of housing :- Flats, Council, two bed, three bed, four bed, Bungalows, Barn conversions and posh. The only type missing is a lovely residential home where we could end our days!</p> <p>New developments should be limited. Willoughby's population is quite old, on average, and there should be enough housing available as people move on.</p> <p>Affordable housing required for local people who have had to move out of village. Infill could be White House Farm to A45.</p> <p>If you use phrases like "affordable housing" they should mean what they say - ie homes for people on low incomes.</p> <p>More social housing (e.g. housing association or council homes)</p>	<p>All noted.</p> <p>The housing policy wording will be reviewed and amended following the mini survey.</p>	<p>Policy 5 to be updated following mini survey.</p> <p><b>Consider all responses and incorporate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>smaller/starter homes (1 - 2 bedrooms)</u></li> <li>- <u>homes for young families (2 - 3 bedrooms)</u></li> <li>- <u>smaller homes for older residents (1 - 2 bedrooms)</u></li> <li>- <u>affordable housing</u></li> </ul>

<p><b>Settlement boundary</b></p>	<p>Increase settlement boundary to include sites outside the Category 3 flood zone.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to limit future development to within the 2009 village settlement boundary as some 60% of the village lies within the Cat3 flood zone. This seriously limits areas which can reasonably be developed. Development within the Cat3 zone would need to satisfy stringent flood related planning regulations, making such housing expensive to build and expensive to insure. The 2009 boundary excludes some "brown field" areas and some long established gardens which lie outside the flood plain.</p> <p>I agree with the principles but the drawing of the blue line virtually prevents any new housing with the exception of the top of main street</p> <p>The settlement boundary needs to be adjusted to include Pye Court and Manor Farmhouse with existing barn conversions.</p> <p>New dwellings outside of the village boundary should be discouraged as representing development in the open countryside contrary to policy option 1 a</p>	<p>Rugby Borough Council have determined the settlement boundary and the NDP should conform with local planning policy. New development in rural villages is limited to within settlement boundaries.</p> <p>See Q23 below.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Parking</b></p>	<p>New housing should provide off road parking for at least two cars</p> <p>All new developments should include adequate on site parking provision</p> <p>You need to watch the amount of new vehicles being added to the narrow roads in the village</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Include reference to on site parking in policy.</p>	<p><b><u>Include reference to on site parking in policy.</u></b></p>
<p><b>Q23 Development next to settlement boundary</b></p>	<p>Yes 35.71% 40 No 57.14% 64 Not Answered 7.14% 8</p>	<p>Majority of responses as objections noted.</p>	<p><b>Maintain existing settlement boundary.</b></p>

<p><b>Q24</b>  <b>Anyone Left</b>  <b>Willoughby</b>  <b>Parish in last 5</b>  <b>years?</b></p>	<p>Yes 16.07% 18  No 79.46% 89  Not Answered 4.46% 5</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Q25</b>  <b>Reason</b></p>	<p>Passed away  My husband died  Death</p> <p>University and now living away.</p> <p>Work and marriage  Work  Divorce</p> <p>No suitable housing available  To seek accomodation  Locally born &amp; bred children unwillingly leave the area due to lack of freehold housing at the lower end of the market.  The 'Don't move - improve' trend (recently exacerbated by higher stamp duty) is stagnating the housing flow to the younger generation and simultaneously pricing them out the local market.  Commuter money buys and improves - Locally earned money ends up buying in town  No affordable housing  Housing cost and availability in village  Too expensive, no local facilities.  The village and amenities too restrictive for younger people/families  Purchased a house in Braunston  Not sure about question 23, 26 or 29 as we are not full time residents in Willoughby.  n/a</p>	<p>Note housing availability and cost - use in supporting text in housing chapter.</p>	<p><b>Add information to supporting text - refer to lack of housing availability and cost.</b></p> <p><b>Also refer to lack of facilities as reasons given for moving away in community facilities chapter.</b></p>

<b>Q26 Wanting to move into Willoughby</b>	Yes 25.00% 28 No 67.86% 76 Not Answered 7.14% 8	Noted. Evidence of demand / need noted.	<b>Add information to supporting text.</b>
<b>Q27 Sort of housing</b>	Housing for first time buyers (1-2 bed) 20.54% 23 Family housing (3-4 bed) 10.71% 12 Larger family housing (4+ bed) 1.79% 2 Housing for older people (1-2 bed) 17.86% 20 Special needs / accessible housing 7.14% 8 Other (please specify) 12.50% 14 Not Answered 66.07% 74	Noted. Evidence of demand / need noted - predominantly smaller housing.	<b>Add information to supporting text.</b>
<b>Q28 Other</b>	Housing and infrastructure to create more vibrant rural community  As already indicated, all of this is very uncertain as we are not full time residents of Willoughby. n/a	Noted.	No change.
<b>Starter homes / small</b>	Starter home or shared ownership Starter home Small property Freehold housing for first time buyers	Noted. Evidence of demand / need noted - predominantly smaller housing, first time buyers.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>
<b>2-3 bed</b>	Smaller house 2-3 beds with more land	Noted. Evidence of demand / need noted - predominantly smaller housing.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>
<b>Shared ownership</b>	Shared Ownership for first time buyers	Noted. Evidence of shared ownership need.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>
<b>Single storey / flats / bungalows</b>	Single-storey would be the only sensible option. Flat/small apartments, but this seems unlikely ie bungalow/dormer bungalow  Several bungalows would be ideal for elderly people living in large houses but wish to stay in village  As people age, there could be a need for appropriate, sheltered care accommodation. Community sheltered/caring living.	Noted. Evidence of single storey / housing for older people.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>

	A bungalow & small detached house 2-3 bedrooms		
<b>Q29 Housing Tenure</b>	Market housing to rent 8.93% 10 Market housing to buy 26.79% 30 Affordable to rent 4.46% 5 Affordable to buy (including shared ownership) 15.18% 17 Other (please specify) 2.68% 3 Not Answered 65.18% 73	Noted.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>
<b>Q30 Other</b>	Communal rented. Possible conversion of outbuilding on own property. Housing, possibly, within boundary of own property.	Noted.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>
<b>Q29 Leaving in next 10 years</b>	Yes 32.14% 36 No 59.82% 67 Not Answered 8.04% 9	Noted.	No change.
<b>Q30 Why? General</b>	Hope not We never want to leave Willoughby. It is a beautiful place to live and we are very happy here.	Noted.	No change.
<b>Lack of Housing</b>	Too expensive, need a car, no shop No housing available for offspring Growing up and no suitable housing No affordable housing No affordable housing for young people Lack of housing Daughter will be old enough to leave and purchase her own house Building a house elsewhere	Noted.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>
<b>Changing Housing Need</b>	Unlikely I couldn't say at this stage, but a possible option would be to <u>downsize</u> . May downsize Down sizing LACK OF SMALLER HOUSING FOR OLDER PEOPLE Lack of housing for older people Kids grown up. We may downsize and move to a location with more facilities. Downsizing	Noted.	<b>Add information to supporting text and policy.</b>  <b>Need for more smaller housing for people to downsize to in order to remain in village.</b>

	Retirement - need of small house Retire Retirement OLD AGE! Age Age Old age! Old age. Not intentionally - ill health or infirmity Death To see other parts of the country Move away from Daventry (transportation hub) Move abroad Moving to Spain? (Who knows) Moving abroad Development outside settlement line. Development of Lodge Farm. At the moment we have no idea whether this will apply.		
<b>Lack of Facilities</b>	The village as is simply does not offer enough diversity or sustainable rural community, although its a great location but needs developing		
<b>University / Work</b>	Going to university Work related Work		
<b>Family</b>	Family Possibly. Locate nearer to family. To be closer to family/friends		
<b>Q31 Business Development</b>	Yes 84.82% 95 No 9.82% 11 Not Answered 5.36% 6	Strong support noted.	<b>Include policy in NDP</b>
<b>Q32 Comments to improve policy - General</b>	I would prefer 'small businesses' rather than 'micro businesses' in the title and B5. Willoughby is only ever going to be a dormitory settlement with modest levels of agricultural employment	Accepted - amend micro to small.	<b><u>Amend "micro" to "small."</u></b>

	<p>Business could be good for village growth</p> <p>Small business preferably that benefits the village</p> <p>Home working (ticked)          Businesses in existing redundant rural buildings (ticked).          Small scale economic development          - not in favour (crossed)</p> <p>Proposals need to be assessed individually</p> <p>More use could be made of existing "public" facilities eg the Village Hall, the Rose, and St. Nicholas Church. For example: a library at the VH, a small convenience store at the Rose, a Sunday School at the Church.</p> <p>Conditions need to be imposed to stop subsequent development into houses if business closes.</p> <p>Need a reliable mobile network especially at the White Barn end of the village          Good broadband is important but this has improved recently.          Leave the village unchanged</p>		
<p><b>Traffic, cars, parking</b></p>	<p>Given the ever expanding commercial development along the A45 corridor between Daventry and Braunston the need for any significant development in or close to be Willoughby must surely be limited. Especially as traffic through the village is at times "significant" To a degree. Business development should be kept to an absolute minimum and not business that require use of large vehicles or large amount of cars.</p> <p>However providing any new business does not increase noise or light pollution or damage the capabilities of the infrastructure.</p>	<p>Address distribution - not encouraged.</p> <p>Car parking already mentioned in policy.</p>	<p><b><u>Add in criteria about controlling use of large vehicles - haulage etc to be resisted.</u></b></p>



	<p>No smelly, noisy, visually unattractive, or traffic-inducing business developments.</p> <p>As long as it does not include large HGVs</p> <p>Parking problems Adequate parking is a must May be a case to designate the café/car wash former station yard area and the former garage across the road as a business zone</p>		
<b>Residential amenity</b>	<p>Businesses are to make money for their owners. If a business is proposed which has negative impact on neighbours' financial situation (for example house value) or their standard of living, then that should have as much significance as the financial incentive for the owner of the proposed business.</p>	<p>Refer to need to protect residential amenity in policy.</p>	<p><b><u>Refer to need to protect residential amenity in policy - noise, disturbance etc.</u></b></p>
<b>Q33 Currently work from home</b>	<p>Yes 19.64% 22 No 74.11% 83 Not Answered 6.25% 7</p>	<p>Significant proportion noted.</p>	<p><b>Add to supporting text.</b></p>
<b>Q34 Nature of business</b>	<p>Acupuncture Acupuncture practice Administration I do occasionally work from home - admin work for Warwickshire CC. Automotive engineering Business consultancy Business Consultancy Company director employing 100+ staff in broader Warwickshire area Farmer Farming Farming &amp; Sports Development Internet sales IT Market trading</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p><b>Add examples to supporting text.</b></p>

	<p>Pharmaceuticals  Work from home partially- project management.  Sales  School Clerk to Governors  Servicing, spares, repairs  Occasional work from home to avoid transit to Birmingham office - software engineer.  Transcription work  Writing. Alpaca breeding business.  Although the answer is currently "No" I have done until very recently, in the legal field.</p>		
<p><b>Q35</b>  <b>Improvements to local facilities to support businesses</b>  <b>General</b></p>	<p>A better/transparent knowledge of what and where they are based (underlined) and can be accessed within Willoughby and nearby villages eg plumber(s) electrician(s) etc  I have a business in Willoughby and I am not allowed to advertise in the village newsletter, and so I pay to advertise in other village newsletters instead. it would be a great idea to allow advertising and this would generate a good revenue for the parish.</p>	Noted - refer to PC	No change
<p><b>Mobile phone</b></p>	<p>Improved mobile phone signal  Better mobile phone cover.  Better mobile phone signal  Better mobile phone coverage.  Better mobile phone reception - e.g. booster signals or mobile phone mast  Mobile phone network accessibility</p>	Noted - refer to PC and Rugby Borough Council	No change
<p><b>Broadband</b></p>	<p>More reliable broadband  Speed of broadband  The key resource is for a more consistent and more powerful internet provision  Faster internet  Improved wifi and mobile telephone  Mobile signal needs to be improved and super fast broadband should be available to all  Fast broadband internet connection. Improved mobile phone signal.</p>	Noted - refer to PC and Rugby Borough Council	No change

	<p>A decent telephone line. The line at Navigation Cottage is very poor and the internet connection comes and goes even since we have been on fibre optic to the cabinet. I suspect it may have something to do with the heavy traffic (quantity and weight) up and down Longdown Lane.</p> <p>Faster broad band, local amenities, local shop coffee shop food outlets</p> <p>Better internet</p> <p>BROADBAND SPEED IS VERY SLOW IN PARTS OF THE VILLAGE.</p> <p>Broadband speed is relatively slow in some parts of the village</p> <p>Broadband, whilst much better, will need to continue to be enhanced.</p> <p>Improved internet access</p> <p>Full Fibre broadband (may be a route to this if the village hall considered a public building as that would then allow properties between it and the cabinet to opt for full fibre</p> <p>Better wifi speeds</p> <p>Better broadband even the new speed isn't great!</p> <p>Faster Broadband</p> <p>Fast Fibre Broadband essential</p> <p>Improved wifi</p> <p>Better wifi, Shop, Post office</p>		
<p><b>Roads / Transport</b></p>	<p>As long as there are good road networks and good broadband speed, Willoughby is a good place to work.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>Additional parking at the Village Hall. Kitchen and toilet facilities at the Church.</p> <p>Car parking. Bus service</p> <p>The village would surely benefit from some form of public transport</p> <p>A bus service that comes into the village. We have redundant bus stops here.</p> <p>Regular bus service</p> <p>Yes. Bus transport</p> <p>Road infrastructure improvements - more passing places.</p> <p>Road improvements</p>	<p>Noted - refer to PC and Rugby Borough Council</p>	<p>No change</p>

<b>Shop / PO / Pubs</b>	A post box at the village church end of the village Small shop A shop/post office. Bus services A small general store would be a great benefit to the village I think a village store would improve the village and be helpful particularly to older residents This village needs its own village store would improve village and particularly help the older residents Bank or post office The pub needs to be made friendly to villagers	Rural shops etc are under pressure and rely on a local customer base to survive.  Policy 6 would support such development if a proposal came forward.	No change.
<b>Business premises</b>	More potential business premises in central/accessible village locations and slightly more residents who could help local businesses to be sustainable.	Policy 6 supports this.	No change.
<b>Q36 Protect existing community and recreational facilities</b>	Yes 89.29% 100 No 0.89% 1 Not Answered 9.82% 11	Significant support noted.	<b>Include policy in NDP.</b>
<b>Q37 New health, educational and community facilities</b>	Yes 82.14% 92 No 4.46% 5 Not Answered 13.39% 15	Significant support noted.	<b>Include policy in NDP.</b>
<b>Q38 Important facilities</b>	Village Hall 88.39% 99 Cricket Club 69.64% 78 Playing Field & Playground 82.14% 92 Allotments 53.57% 60 Church 75.00% 84 Pub 83.93% 94 Hayward Lodge 64.29% 72 Amenity Garden 69.64% 78 Other (please specify) 23.21% 26 Not Answered 6.25% 7	Noted.	<b>Add to evidence / supporting text.</b>

<b>Q39 Other important facilities</b>	All of the above are important for village life although not necessarily to us personally.	Noted	No change
<b>Pond / Watercourse</b>	Village - pond Village pond area The pond The duck pond is a great asset Duck pond The village pond The pond Pond The pond (belongs to parish). Small areas by Willoughby sign and island by pond. Village pond on Lower Street. Village pond Pond Village pond Ponds, can we have more or even a small lake? The brook runs down bottom end of village looked after, cleaned out, more, flood committee could do better	All are covered in other policies.	No change.
<b>Chapel . Four Crosses</b>	The Chapel on Main Street. The Smithy on Main Street. The 4 Crosses building	All are covered in other policies.	No change.
<b>Footpaths</b>	Footpaths, around and across adjacent fields eg for dog walking. Local footpaths and bridleways Recognised public footpaths over private land FOOT PATHS Foot paths Village - footpaths.	All are covered in other policies.	No change.
<b>Amenity garden</b>	Amenity garden The map of the village and points of interest Village Hall Garden	All are covered in other policies.	No change.

<b>Car park</b>	Car park	All are covered in other policies.	No change.
<b>Cricket Club</b>	Cricket club even though I don't use it, it's huge (underlined) as a village facility/amenity	All are covered in other policies.	No change.
<b>Other / Businesses</b>	Beauty salon Salon Cafe and car wash	All are covered in other policies.	No change.
<b>Q40 Important local open spaces General</b>	<p>All of Willoughby open spaces no expansion needed!!!</p> <p>We see no reason for development to take place on the "green" spaces contained within the existing village boundary which we consider to be a special asset The village is surrounded by beautiful green space with public footpaths which are enjoyed by many and this should be protected - often we meet visitors to this area who say how lovely it is.</p> <p>If it's green keep it green</p> <p>All surrounding fields</p> <p>Fields around Willoughby should be protected because of the nature of what the village is. Willoughby will lose its value.</p> <p>Fields just outside village i.e. where proposed crematorium, land behind houses, currently paddocks and stabling.</p> <p>Open fields outside the settlement boundary</p> <p>Fields along Woolscot Road.</p> <p>Big grounds. Agricultural land - once lost, cannot be regained.</p> <p>Any (underlined) open spaces within the designated flood plain - reason - obviously they may flood!</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Areas outside the settlement boundary (rural areas) are protected from development.</p>	No change.

	<p>Local green spaces should be protected because the village will lose its identity</p> <p>Every where within 500 metres of my back yard</p> <p>It's been noticed how people that live in what were once 'unwanted new build' houses soon also believe that no further development should be permitted!</p> <p>Large gardens in the village should not (underlined) be built on or developed.</p>		
<b>Pond Area</b>	<p>Near the duck pond</p> <p>The pond and green as they are integral to making Willoughby feel like a village.</p> <p>Village green, pond</p> <p>Village Pond</p> <p>Village pond for ecological and aesthetic reasons.</p>	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Pye Court Area</b>	<p>Between Brooks Close and Pye Court.</p> <p>The field between Brooks Close and Pye Court.</p> <p>Field where the old manor originally stood between Pye Courtr and the church and where the market licences where issued by a Court, hence Pye Poudre Court.</p> <p>Between Pye Court and Lower Street.</p>	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Moat</b>	The Moat and view towards St. Nicholas Church from Moor Lane.	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Around Church</b>	<p>Field between Church and Moor Lane. Any development here would spoil the views to and from the church</p> <p>Church meadow at rear of the church</p>	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Grass verges</b>	<p>All grass verges bounding the brook.</p> <p>Grass verges and swales.</p>	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?

<b>Village Centre</b>	In Main Street old gaol site  Willoughby village sign at centre of village.	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Recreation Area / Playing Fields</b>	The playing field and park. Playing fields Ground round Village Hall. Green areas associated with the village hall and the Rose. Playing field -- to maintain a play area for children The park Cricket Field to maintain a local cricket field.	Recreation areas are already protected in other planning policies.	No change.
<b>Fields behind playground</b>	Field behind play grounds. Between Old Vicarage and Playing Field. The fields behind the village hall	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Orchard</b>	Orchard along far end of Lower Street.	Steering group to consider against criteria in NPPF	Possible inclusion of area as a Local Green Space?
<b>Footpaths</b>	The footpath area that links Lower Street with The Rose Inn; The track over Foxes Cover; And tracks between Willoughby and Grandborough Public footpaths for walking on (health). The public footpath and surrounding area towards both Braunston and Grandborough; Public footpaths and surrounding area towards the canal paths. Local minor roadways for walking, cycling and riding	Public rights of way are protected under other planning policies and legislation.	No change.
<b>Q41 Other comments related to NDP General</b>	Consideration should be given to any planning, as the countryside is being eradicated and lost  I agree with the plan to protect the character of Willoughby and that any development should be in keeping with the existing housing and rural area. The current amenities are an important part of village life.  Too many small house need more family homes rent, and buy. no more bungalows!	Noted.	No change.



	<p>We should be prepared to accept some modest expansion of the village, in the right locations and sympathetic to the better aspects of the village's existing character. The existing settlement boundary is illogical to the north-west and south-east of the village as it excludes existing dwellings that are clearly part of the village (e.g. Pye Court). There is sensible scope of in-fill, as well as replacement of existing low-quality housing.</p> <p>Any development applications should be published openly in the village magazine/newsletter and any contentious plans should be discussed in a village meeting at the VH.</p> <p>No No No</p> <p>Willoughby is a small village and should stay that way.</p> <p>Leave the village unchanged (apart from perhaps a Waitrose branch in place of a few ugly council houses)</p> <p>We do not need any more planning in village My comments would not make for nothing. 12 to 18 months time us Willoughby people will know the outcome of the planning policy in the village.</p> <p>Major developments around the village will strip the village of any identity. The towns around are expanding so villages should become more sacred.</p> <p>From Q3C - (re. solar panels) "Although with current tariffs they aren't viable at present."</p>		
<b>Facilities</b>	<p>The facilities offered in the village 25 years ago have mainly died due to no new housing being provided to support them. Now that some facilities are returning it is essential to ensure that a small number of houses are built annually to support local amenities.</p>	<p>We understand discussions have been taking place with Rugby Borough Council about the Village Hall car park.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	Please check the line of the settlement boundary behind the village hall as it is due to be the new car park		
<b>Housing</b>	<p>There are no first time buyers houses or council houses available for local people</p> <p>As per email exchanges a clear picture of the housing stock as it is today is necessary in order to determine whether new properties are in fact necessary also consideration of facilitating multi-generational living would be wise.</p>	Noted - refer to housing policies.	No change.
<b>Parking</b>	<p>Large lorries should be banned from the village. Need a 20mph speed limit for Main Street and Lower Street - especially for large vehicles including agricultural vehicles</p> <p>Parking issues - cars, vans, caravans etc. conditions of pavements. overhanging hedges</p>	Noted. Refer to PC.	No change.
<b>All other comments / questions / non NDP matters - refer to PC for information and possible action.</b>			