

Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement Attachment 7b

Comments and Actions Resulting From Regulation 14 Consultation

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S01	Highways England	General	<p>Given the small scale nature of planned development growth and the distance of the Plan area from the SRN we consider that there will be no impacts on the operation of the A46.</p> <p>We have no further comments to provide and trust that the above is useful in the progression of the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	No change required.
S02	Lincolnshire County Council	General	<p>As you may be aware, it is a statutory requirement that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, including the minerals and waste policies. I would therefore ask that you have particular regard to the policies in the CSDMP and SLD that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard existing minerals and waste sites from incompatible development; • Safeguard Mineral Resources to prevent unnecessary sterilisation by development; and • Identify the locational criteria and allocations for future minerals and waste development. 	The Steering Group is aware that the Sewerage Treatment Works site in Glentworth and of the two Mineral Sites in the Parish. No Policies in the NP affect these sites nor have a detrimental impact on the present operation or future use of these resources.	No change required.
S03	Nettleham Parish Council	General	There is no demographic profile included for the village, no population size or breakdown shown, only reference to the deprivation index. It is important to give a clear indication of the community make up.	The Steering Group believes the information contained in the introduction to the Plan is sufficient to provide context to the Plan and to support the Vision, Objectives and Policies contained in it.	No change required.
S04	Nettleham Parish Council	General	There would seem to be little consideration of the future needs of the community, and how life can be enhanced for future generations, without this the community risks dying.	The Vision addresses the future need of the community and paint the type of village Glentworth will be in 20 years' time.	No change required.
S05	Nettleham Parish Council	General	Little consideration appears to have been given to older members of the community and how they will be able to cope in their later years given the travel issues raised, is it a given that they will have to move away?	It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan can only contain land use planning policies, hence traffic and transport policies cannot be included in the plan.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S06	Nettleham Parish Council	General	Are the children currently taken to school in parents' cars, could there be aspiration for more sustainable modes of transport?	It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan can only contain land use planning policies, hence traffic and transport policies cannot be included in the plan. The Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan protects existing and supports additional footpaths and bridleways, thus promoting more sustainable modes of transport.	No change required.
S07	Nettleham Parish Council	General	Surely fast broadband service should be a key aspiration for the future. This item is mentioned in the policies but could be stronger, due to its growing importance and especially in a small rural community.	It is considered that fast broadband issues are addressed as part of Policy 5 in the most comprehensive way possible within the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan can only contain land use planning policies.	No change required.
S08	West Lindsey District Council	General	The neighbourhood character profile recommends a residential development policy. Where is this within the NP?	<p>Based on existing commitments, to meet the minimum requirements in terms of residential development set in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Glentworth is expected to grow by 4 additional dwellings before 2036. Considering this limited growth, the Steering Group decided not to allocate sites as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Steering Group also reached the conclusion that a criteria-based policy in the Neighbourhood Plan would have added little to Policies LP2, LP4 and LP55 of the CLLP. To avoid unnecessary duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a residential development policy.</p> <p>The Parish welcomes future development as long as they comply with the criteria of the CLLP. By not applying a residential development policy more restrictive than the CLLP, it could be argued that the Neighbourhood Plan is actually facilitating and encouraging development.</p>	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S09	West Lindsey District Council	General	The general approach to development could be interpreted as defensive, by not providing a proactive steer to housing development a consequence could be that you get unwanted development.	<p>In the absence of a housing development policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, the policies of the CLLP apply in terms of location of future development, in particular Policies LP2, LP4 and LP55. These policies are considered adequate for the Parish and, in order to avoid duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a residential development policy.</p> <p>The Parish welcomes future development as long as it complies with the criteria of the CLLP. By not applying a residential development policy more restrictive than the CLLP, it could be argued that the Neighbourhood Plan is actually facilitating and encouraging development.</p>	No change required.
S10	West Lindsey District Council	General	Why have the group opted for the NP to have no mention of residential development?	<p>As explained above, the provision of the CLLP was considered sufficient to promote the necessary level of development in Glentworth.</p> <p>The community was mostly concerned with the quality and design of future development. The Neighbourhood Plan presents the perfect opportunity to define the character of the settlement and set it into a comprehensive report (the Neighbourhood Profile) and prepare policies to ensure future development respects this character (Policy 5). Moreover, the Plan permitted to add additional levels of protection to open spaces and green infrastructure in the Parish (Policy 2 and Policy 3).</p>	No change required.
S11	West Lindsey District Council	General	Assuming the target for growth and the capacity of sites, it appears that you'll need at least 4 sites for development over the plan period. Where are the developments going to go?	<p>In the absence of a housing development policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, the policies of the CLLP apply in terms of location of future development, in particular Policies LP2, LP4 and LP55. These policies are considered adequate for the Parish and, in order to avoid duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a residential development policy.</p>	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S12	West Lindsey District Council	General	There is also no acknowledgement of extant planning permissions, infill plots within the settlement and on top road, or that the village is a strategic area for growth.	In the absence of a housing development policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, the policies of the CLLP apply in terms of location of future development, in particular Policies LP2, LP4 and LP55. These policies are considered adequate for the Parish and, in order to avoid duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a residential development policy. In particular, Policy LP4 of the CLLP will give priority to brownfield, infill policies.	No change required.
S13	West Lindsey District Council	General	Have the group considered meadow view within the NP? For business or specific policy.	The group did not have any particular view on Meadow View to justify a specific policy, and no such view emerged from the consultation with the community.	No change required.
S14	West Lindsey District Council	General	The plan does not address the potential planning issues within the wider parish, for example development in the open countryside/conversions/agricultural diversification.	Policy LP55 of the CLLP is considered adequate for the Parish and, in order to avoid duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a policy addressing development in the countryside.	No change required.
S15	West Lindsey District Council	General	Reference to sustainability scoping report, where can this document be found?	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read "Sustainability Screening Report".
S16	West Lindsey District Council	1.2 (2nd Bullet point)	Replace 'application' with 'applications'	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S17	West Lindsey District Council	1.2 (3rd bullet point)	There is a misplaced full stop within the text.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S18	West Lindsey District Council	2.1	Refers to 19 dwellings but should state 14 to realign with the CLLP.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S19	West Lindsey District Council	3.2	Reference to sustainability scoping report, where can this document be found?	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read "Sustainability Screening Report". Now Paragraph 2.1.4
S20	West Lindsey District Council	3.3/3.4	Further references to scoping report. Tightening of the wording is required about the SA and SEA.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read "Sustainability Screening Report". References to SA and SEA have been removed. Now paragraphs 2.1.4 and 2.1.5

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S21	West Lindsey District Council	3.4	Should 'objective' instead read 'objectives'?	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Mentioning of objectives have been removed from this paragraph. Now Paragraph 2.1.7
S22	West Lindsey District Council	3.6	Reword 'which has will'	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read "The Parish will submit the document...". Now Paragraph 2.2.1
S23	West Lindsey District Council	3.9	Once the plan is 'made' by WLDC it becomes part of the statutory development plan. Remove 'becoming a material consideration for all future planning applications' with 'becoming part of the statutory development plan for the area'.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read "...becoming part of the statutory development plan for the area." Now Paragraph 2.2.5
S24	West Lindsey District Council	4.5	Slight formatting error – the final word of the paragraph is located underneath the map.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S25	West Lindsey District Council	Map on page 13	Could the same style of map, as used on page 7 be used here, so that the exact boundaries can be distinguished? The map in its current form is slightly blurry. This map is also replicated on page 39. Please avoid replication of maps and delete one.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The map has been amended using the cartographic style employed in "Map 1. Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan Area". The map is now referred to in the text as "Map 2. Listed Buildings and Conservation Area". Policy Map 3 is not identical to "Map 2. Listed Buildings and Conservation Area", as it presents additional 'Landmarks' (i.e. non-designated heritage buildings or monuments) that, although non-designated, are valued by local residents and should hence be protected.
S26	West Lindsey District Council	5.6	There is a misplaced full stop within the text.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S27	West Lindsey District Council	5.7	There is a reference to 'frees'. Should this be changed to 'trees'?	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S28	West Lindsey District Council	Section 4 introduction	Please reword will it together'	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The Introduction to the Neighbourhood Plan Policies Section (now Section 5) has been amended to read "Once made by the WLDC, the policies of the Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan will become , with the policies of the CLLP, the Development Plan for the Parish, against which proposals for development will be assessed."
S29	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	A very well constructed policy with good use of CLLP policy LP17.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Support noted.
S30	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	1.1 – The word 'in' is repeated on the first line.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S31	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	For ease of identification, could the bullet points instead be shown as a numerical reference? The numbers should directly match up with those shown on the corresponding map.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The bullet points now read 1.1.1, 1.1.2 ... 1.1.10, and perfectly align with the I.D of the views on the map. The map has been amended using the cartographic style employed in "Map 1. Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan Area".
S32	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	The description of each view does not match up with the description on the map. (there are 10 bullet points but only 9 on the map?)	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to add view number 10 and renumbered to align the description on the map with the description on the policy.
S33	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	1.2 – there are no guiding criteria to such as that provided by the landscape institute to guide development in respect of views and vistas.	This policy adds local context and details to the CLLP LP17. The guiding criteria designed as part of such policy should be applied to the Glentworth-specific views and vistas contained in this policy.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S34	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	<p>1.3 - how would the applicant demonstrate that the development is acceptable in terms of the views and vistas? Would they be required to provide visuals?</p> <p>- does this policy apply to specific developments or all developments? Would seem particularly onerous for a conservatory etc.</p>	<p>The applicant will need to demonstrate how the development does not negatively affect the view as part of their planning application, either in the Design and Access Statement (if required) or in different format (e.g. writing statement). Visual evidence would be welcomed, but it will be responsibility of the planning officers at WLDC to assess whether or not the evidence provided by the applicant demonstrate that the development is acceptable, and if necessary require additional evidence (including visuals).</p> <p>This policy applies to all development that is not permitted development, as they will not need to submit a planning application.</p>	No change required.
S35	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1	What is the difference between a view and a vista?	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	The wording has been removed to replace "Views and Vistas" with "Views".
S36	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 1 Map	Please check the word 'towards' in the key – there seem to be a couple of typos. (Specifically no's 1,2,5,9)	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion	Amended as suggested.
S37	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2	Overall the policy is worded negatively towards development, could the tense be reviewed?	The wording of the Policy replicates the definition of Local Green Space contained in the NPPF.	No change required.
S38	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2	Should the bullet points be replaced with numerical references to align with policy map 2?	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	The bullet points now read 2.1.1, 2.1.2 ... 2.1.4, and THEY perfectly align with the I.D of the LGS on the map.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S39	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2	It is important that the wording used in this policy is aligned with that used in policy LP24 regarding useable green space. Are the spaces identified publicly accessible and useable?	<p>The wording of the Policy replicates the definition of Local Green Space contained in the NPPF.</p> <p>The designation of LGS is based on the criteria contained in paragraphs 76,77, and 78 of the NPPF; there is no requirement for a site to be publically owned and accessible, although the site must be important for the local community. The local importance of these sites has been demonstrated in the LGS Assessment.</p> <p>Policy LP24 refers to a different type of site and different type of designation, hence it does not apply in this situation.</p>	No change required.
S40	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2	2.2 – replace ‘spaces’ with ‘space’ Remove ‘in accordance with the NPPF’	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S41	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2	This map is confusing, it is showing elements that are already shown in a different format.	The map shows the Local Green Spaces mentioned in the Policy. The Map of Open Space Provision only presents the different types of Green space and Open Spaces as presented in the CLLP interactive map and help add context and information to the LGS allocation.	No change required.
S42	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2 Map	The mapping layer is slightly blurry so a more detailed map is required so that the exact boundaries can be defined.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The map has been amended using the cartographic style employed in "Map 1. Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan Area"
S43	West Lindsey District Council	10.1	<p>Space between ‘multi-’and ‘functional’</p> <p>The paragraph includes quotations from the NPPF. However, these are not direct quotations. If they plan wants to directly quote the NPPF then it needs to be exact – currently, this is not.</p> <p>The use of the term ‘etc.’ needs to be reviewed. Is this the correct term for a planning policy document?</p>	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The direct quote has been removed. The term "etc." has been removed from the Plan
S44	West Lindsey District Council	10.4	Has no text.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S45	West Lindsey District Council	10.5	The paragraph could provide the names of the footpaths and bridleways.	See R34. Largely complete but need to remove "under threat of closure" with reference to the the footpath between Glentworth and Harpswell. The Working Group is unaware of any generally-accepted names.	No change required.
S46	West Lindsey District Council	10.6	The use of the term 'etc.' needs to be reviewed.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The term "etc." has been removed from the Plan
S47	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	It is unclear what the policy is seeking to achieve. More positive wording would be beneficial.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion. The Policy aims to protect existing footpaths, bridleways and natural and semi-natural green infrastructures, and support development that delivers additional ones.	Section 5.1 has been amended to read "Development proposals will be supported where...:", to present a more positive wording.
S48	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	Where have these sites derived from?	Central Lincolnshire Open Space Audit and Provision Standard Assessment CLLP Interactive Map Definitive Map of Public Right of Ways of the Lincolnshire County Council. Please confront with the Justification Text.	No change required.
S49	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	It is not clear what existing green corridors are and infrastructure assets.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The term 'green infrastructure asset' has been defined in the Justification Text. Any reference to other terms have been removed from the Policy.
S50	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	It needs to be made clear the distinction between the areas of green infrastructure and local green space. Is it the intention that the areas can be both green infrastructure and local green space or do you want the designation to remain individual?	The LGS are clearly defined in the NPPF and Section 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The designations are and must remain separate, as they have two different level of protection. As explained in the NPPF, not all sites can enjoy the level of protection granted by the LGS designation. However, residents identified a number of additional sites that, although not suited to be designated as LGS, are important from a natural/landscape point of view and should be granted a certain level of protection. Policy 3 aim to do that.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S51	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	Please consider changing the bullet points to numerical references for ease of identification.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S52	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	Criterion 2 of 3.2 needs re-wording as it does not follow on from the preceding sentence.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S53	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 3	All the areas shown on the map should be individually identified and defined, similar to what you have done with the views and vistas and should be listed in both policy 3 and policy map 3.	Not all sites have an individual name. These sites have been identified in other evidence base studies supporting the CLLP: The Neighbourhood Plan is adding local context to these documents identifying local sites for additional protection.	No change required.
S54	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	Consider positively rewording.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S55	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	Please consider changing the bullet points to numerical references that correspond with policy map 4, for ease of identification.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S56	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	4.1 – refers to policy map 8. Please correct.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S57	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	Is there a substantial need for the post box and notice board to be designated? If so how will 4.2 specifically apply to these?	The two elements are important features and provide a community service. Although their use of modification does not require planning application (e.g. they are not affected by section 4.2), they could be negatively affected by nearby development proposals and should be protected from detrimental impact.	No change required.
S58	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	Does this policy add anything in addition to that contained within the CLLP.	This policy identifies locally important community facilities, hence it adds detail and local context to the CLLP.	No change required.
S59	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	4.3 – the above point applies to the use of bullet points in this section.	This policy identifies locally important community facilities, hence it adds detail and local context to the CLLP.	No change required.
S60	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4	What about the provision of new community facilities?	Section 4.2 has been added to support the provision of additional community facilities.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S61	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 4 Map	The exact location of these should be easily distinguishable from the map. Currently they are not. Please review the mapping layers and scale.	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	The map has been amended using the cartographic style employed in "Map 1. Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan Area".
S62	West Lindsey District Council	12.2	Please remove reference to policy 11	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	No change required.
S63	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 5	Is there a background assessment of the existing infrastructure to support this policy?	<p>Improvement to the broadband connectivity is an aspiration for the village raised by several residents in Glentworth, as well as a national priority mentioned in the NPPF. There are also accounts of problems with the current broadband connection system, collected through the consultation exercise.</p> <p>No formal technical assessment of the existing infrastructure has been done: the Working Group have although collected information on the provision of internet connectivity in the Village and added this information in the Justification Text.</p> <p>As the policy supports future technical innovation in the field of broadband, the Working Group believes such an assessment is not necessary to support the policy, and that it will be developer's responsibilities to demonstrate that the scheme presents the highest possible solutions in terms of connectivity and broadband.</p>	No change required.
S64	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 5	Does this policy consider permitted development rules?	Neighbourhood Plan policies cannot change permitted development rights, so the Policy does not affect the permitted development rules.	No change required.
S65	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 5	Could the justification provide some more information as to when this policy could be applied?	The aim of the Policy is to promote the introduction of up-to-date broadband connectivity infrastructures in the village. As such, the Policy will mostly apply when new development is built and hence it offers the opportunity to expand and connect to the network.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S66	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 5	Would this better be suited as an aspiration?	Considering that the Policy will affect planning application and land use, it is believed to be suited as a Neighbourhood Planning policy.	No change required.
S67	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 5	External telecommunications works like this could impact other policies within this plan. E.g. masts could impact on views and vistas.	The Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan need to be considered organically and not in isolation. Development that has a detrimental impact on views and vistas listed in Policy 1 will not be supported.	No change required.
S68	West Lindsey District Council	13.3	The paragraph provides a reference to 'non-designated' heritage assets. Where are these defined?	Comment noted with and agree with suggestion.	The definition of 'non-designated heritage asset' has been added to the Justification Text, and the relation with the term 'Landmark' has been clarified. The term 'Landmark' has been removed from the Policy text.
S69	West Lindsey District Council	13.5	3rd line – this sentence may need re-wording. Reference to 'neighbourhood profile report'. Provides reference to non-designated heritage assets and landmarks. The landmarks are noted within the character report but non-des assets are not.	Comment noted with and agree with suggestion.	The definition of 'non-designated heritage asset' has been added to the Justification Text, and the relation with the term 'Landmark' has been clarified. The term 'Landmark' has been removed from the Policy text.
S70	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	6.1 Reference to 'neighbourhood profile report'.	Comment noted with and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read 'Neighbourhood Character Profile Report'.
S71	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Please consider changing the bullet points to numerical references for ease of identification. Bullet point 1 – spelling of neighbouring. Please check.	Comment noted with and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S72	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Bullet point 2 – Is linear the right word? Is it a tight linear settlement? Doesn't fit in with standard definition of linear or nucleus etc.	Comment noted with and agree with suggestion.	The bullet point has been amended to read 'linear' in place of "tight linear": the majority of the properties directly face a very limited number of streets, providing the feeling of a linear development.
S73	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Bullet point 4 – reference to neighbourhood profile report.	Comment noted with and agree with suggestion.	Amended to read Neighbourhood Character Profile Report.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S74	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Bullet point 5 – refers to locally distinctive features, could the profile report highlight these.	The locally distinctive features are identified in the tables and described in length in Neighbourhood Character Profile Report.	No change required.
S75	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Is a full stop required at the end of ‘verges’?	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
S76	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	6.2 – is it reasonable to expect all developments to demonstrate consideration of flood risk and awareness of SuDS. Does this policy offer more than what is provided within the local plan?	All development should demonstrate to have considered flood risk and the eventuality to exacerbate the risk on site and off site: the planning application can demonstrate that the development does not cause additional risk and thus it does not require SUDs solutions.	No change required.
S77	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	6.3 – when implementing this policy, what is adequate access and parking? Could the plan define exact off street parking figures? How do WLDC define what a family car is? Could more details be provided?	<p>Comment noted and agree with suggestion. Adequate parking and access will depend on the typology and size of the development.</p> <p>There has been account of problems caused by on-street parking, collected through the consultation exercise. The aim of the Policy is to ensure there is enough parking on site to accommodate for the number of cars an average household in the Parish is expected to possess (especially considered the relatively high car ownership rate in Lincoln).</p>	The term ‘family car’ has been removed and amended with the more generic ‘vehicle’, specifying that enough space need to be allowed for the driver to comfortably get in and out of the car.
S78	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	6.4 – replace ‘meets’ with ‘meet’. Does this policy offer more than what is provided within the local plan?	The Policy does not require all new development to meet the access standards of Part M Building Regulations, but simply express a presumption in favor of those that do.	Amended as suggested.
S79	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	To inform this policy further it may be useful to have more detailed profile report giving specific design detail such as advice on materials.	The Neighbourhood Character Profile contains design detail and advice on material.	No change required.
S80	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Glentworth has a conservation area and important listed buildings which merit a separate planning policy.	The Working Group believes that the current legislation sufficiently protects the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings, and that a specific policy will only duplicate this work.	No change required.
S81	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6	Could the plan make more use of the conservation area appraisal which is shown as a supporting document?	The Conservation Area Appraisal is directly cited in section 3.1.4	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Action
S82	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 6 Map	<p>The exact location of these should be easily distinguishable from the map. Currently they are not. Please review the mapping layers and scale.</p> <p>Should the map just show the 'landmarks' not the other data which is already shown in the document?</p>	Comment noted and agree with suggestion.	Amended to solely show Non-designated Heritage Assets.
S83	West Lindsey District Council	Section 6	Does there need to be a comment about how CIL will be used to fund some of these projects? Have the group/PC considered a priority list?	Considered the small number of expected development the C.I.L. will be very limited, and the Working Group did not consider a comment necessary.	No change required.
S84	West Lindsey District Council	Section 6	Any reference to maintenance should be removed as it is usually the responsibility of a third party. Instead the section could focus on 3 or 4 specific projects, with broad community benefits. WLDC suggest the following are kept – Picnic area, play equipment, more benches, pocket park and replace seats.	Although maintenance is a responsibility of third parties, most of them are resident associations or volunteers, and referencing these actions in the Plan can promote such work.	No change required.
S85	West Lindsey District Council	Section 6	1st paragraph – if you don't want the priorities to be examined, then please remove from the document. Non- planning priorities can be stated in the plan. Some of the proposals could be shown on a map eg. Community orchard, picnic area, dog park – could be shown on the community facilities map. Replace 'footback' with 'footpath'	Comment noted and agree with suggestion. Community orchard, picnic area, dog park are not existing community facilities, so they cannot be identified on the map.	Replaced 'footback' with 'footpath': To be amended.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS01	1	Part A	Found sections 1 & 2 of the Consultation difficult to read and understand.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Sections 1 and 2 have been amended to make them more understandable.
NS02	1	Part A	It was my understanding that the amount of houses to be build had come down to 14 and not 19 as stated	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS03	3	Part A	I very much support the approach of villagers having their say in the future development of the Parish, and therefore support the Plan & Policies	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Support noted.
NS04	3	Design and Character	Can we specify that stonework shouldn't be standard square block cladding/facing, but should reflect local "irregular" patterns.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	The Neighbourhood Character Profile paragraph 33 has been amended to read "Stonework should reflect the local irregular pattern of traditional Stoneworks".
NS05	6	Broadband Connection	At this time this needs to be greatly improved.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	No change required.
NS06	8	Views and Vistas	From both the top of Coachroad Hill looking down the hill and the view from the bottom to the top can be impressive. Between late January and mid March the woodlands on either side of the road are spectacularly covered with carpeting snowdrops, a site which would be difficult to match this side of Hodsock Priory ! This is followed by woodland plants such as bluebells, ramsons, daffodils and hellibores. Buzzards,owls, woodpeckers and pheasants frequent the woods.	The Working Group believe that the views identified in Policy 2 cover the view proposed in this comment as well.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS07	8	Not specified	<p>Consideration should be given to the walls and buildings of the walled garden adjacent to Glentworth Hall, parts of which may be Elizabethan . This largely Georgian structure has much historic value and may need some protection and listed status.</p> <p>The 'Fish Pond' a small drained and silted up lake fed by a spring near Coachroad Hill and situated just East of the Hall was once an important feature of the 18th century gardens of Glentworth Hall. The restoration i.e. dredging and refilling would enhance the area greatly. It could then become an exceptional wildlife reserve. In addition, Roman building materials together with a coin of Constantius III were discovered in the vicinity of the fish pond in the late 1970s. The area clearly has historic and archaeological value.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The restoration of the pond east of Glentworth Hall has been included as a community aspiration. The historic significance and heritage of the village will be protected thanks to the policies in the Plan, especially Policy 3 : Design and Character of Development.</p>	No change required.
NS08	8	Green Infrastructure	<p>The footpath from the pig farm to Harpswell is presently ploughed over and should be re-established. It has clear importance in linking the Spring Line Villages. These are linked south of Glentworth though Fillingham and beyond. Footpaths exist north of Harpswell with access through to Kirton Lindsey but there is no footpath to Harpswell. The re-establishment of this footpath would enhance the area and attract both local and visiting walkers.</p> <p>Walkers and horse riders are largely restricted to the roads in and around Glentworth. Permissive footpaths and bridleways around the edges of the larger fields would improve access to the countryside. Permissive bridleways are widely used in neighbouring Nottinghamshire and landowners here should be approached with a view to introducing these facilities.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The protection and improvement of existing footpaths and bridleways, as well as the creation of additional ones, is an objective for the whole plan and is achieved through Policy 5: Green Infrastructure.</p>	No change required.
NS09	8	Community Aspirations	<p>Right of way in front of Glentworth Hall. This pathway is in a very poor state of repair. Damage is constantly made worse by vehicles moving between the village and Coachroad Hill. Repairs should be made and consideration given to pedestrian traffic only.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The protection and improvement of existing footpaths and bridleways, as well as the creation of additional ones, is an objective for the whole plan and is achieved through Policy 5: Green Infrastructure.</p>	No change required.
NS10	10	Part A	<p>Good but needs more work & tidying up. Please see 3 pages of notes attached</p>	<p>Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.</p>	Points now addressed individually.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS11	10	Character Profile	No such section!	The Neighbourhood Character Profile is a separate document available together with the Plan.	No change required.
NS12	10	Not specified	No mention of future industrial development anywhere. The FEZ is designed to encourage industrial development into the locality. Suggest the plan defines the A15 & A613 parish boundaries as the only possible industrial locations should the need arise in future years.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Mention to the FEZ and the related job creation opportunities have been added in section 1.2.1.
NS13	10	Policies	No specific policy within Glentworth conservation area as to a) development between dwellings b) development in rear gardens c) Height of development. An explicit policy might be very helpful here.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion. Policy 3. and in particular 3.1.1, 3.1.4, and 3.1.7 address all the points mentioned in the comment.	Specific reference to the development in rear gardens have been added in the Neighbourhood Character Profile NSeport, reading "Development proposals in rear gardens should be discouraged".
NS14	10	Policies	No stated policy as to if new housing should being spread randomly around or concentrated in one or more general locations in the Parish or village e.g. Do we want new houses along the south side of Creampoke Crescent? How would the plan cope with such a planning application generated by future FEZ demands? This lack of input is an omission in the plan which could lead to unintended consequences. It is surely a basic purpose of the plan to identify areas in general terms which are suitable/not suitable for housing and industry.	In the absence of a housing development policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, the policies of the CLLP apply in terms of location of future development, in particular Policies LP2, LP4 and LP55. These policies are considered adequate for the Parish and, in order to avoid duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a residential development policy. The Working Group also reached the conclusion that a criteria-based policy in the Neighbourhood Plan would have had added little to Policies LP2, LP4 and LP55 of the CLLP. To avoid unnecessary duplication, the Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a residential development policy.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS15	10	Policy 1 Views and Vistas	Could the plan deal with any proposed housing or other development along the B1398, other than as seen from views 4&7? LP17 permits development with suitable mitigation but this needs reinforcing in the plan. The entire Glentworth GLV skyline zone of the Lincoln ridge where visible from anywhere in the parish should be included in the plan policy as a "key local view" to afford better protection. The current wording of 8.2 / 1.3 leaves potential for skyline development along several parts of the B1398, other than protected by specific view locations nrs. 4 & 7. Create a "key local view" to reinforce LP17's GLV designated area along the entire B1398 in Glentworth.	The Working Group believes that the combination of Policy 1, Policy 3 and Policy 5 is considered sufficient to protect the skyline zone of Lincoln NSide from inappropriate development, as it would be considered countryside, and development in that area is resisted. Meanwhile proposals within, or at the edge of, the village core would be prioritized.	No change required.
NS16	10	Section 2 Glentworth	typo - superfluous plural. Suggest add "oil" 3rd line, avoids assumptions as to their nature.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS17	10	Section 2 Glentworth	typos: - i.) "frees" ii) 2nd sentence ends prematurely.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS18	10	Section 2 Glentworth	lack of transport – rather overlooks the Call Collect service – the bus 354 to/from Gainsborough which turns in the village, the bus 103 to Lincoln & Scunthorpe and the Tesco bus.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Section 3.2.4 has been amended to describe the different public transport opportunities available in the Parish.
NS19	10	Section 2 Glentworth	What about rest of the Parish? Apart from the Hospital & farm, there are many premises on the periphery of the parish, about 15 in total. A shop, a reception venue, a café, a petrol station, a hotel, a transport café, a plant hire site also encompassing, reclamation yard, machinery repairs, small offices, a large new steel fabricators premises, and other businesses, many literally abutting the A15 parish boundary.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Reference to these businesses have been added to 3.2.4. It is noted that the majority of these businesses mentioned lie just outside the Parish Boundary.
NS20	10	Objectives	environment objective 3. Nice sentiment, but really needs an 11.4 page 31 adding.	The Working Group was unable to decipher this comment.	No change required.
NS21	10	Objectives	environment objective 5. What sort of support? Be specific, otherwise GPC might be asked for financial support.	In the view of the Working Group, the respondent's concern is not justified.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS22	10	Policy 1 Views and Vistas	Policy 1.2 & 1.3. Reeks of appeasement. Why always support? Decisions should be determined on a case by case basis, not granted automatic support.	The National Planning Policy requires the wording of policies to be positive and supportive of good development. The Policy sets requirements for the protection and enhancement of key views, and does not grant automatic support. Decisions are determined on a case by case basis by WLDC Planning Authority, using, amongst other, the provision contained in the Neighbourhood Plan Policies.	No change required.
NS23	10	Policy 2 Local Green Space	map 3 Cemetery should be in blue	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Cemetery is blue on Map 4 Open Space Provisions: Glentworth Village.
NS24	10	Policy 3 Green Infrastructures	10.5 is riddled with inaccuracies. I suggest correctly & clearly showing which is foot and which is bridle on the map i.e. The ROW from Glentworth Grange does not end in a dead end as claimed, but the lack of signage could perhaps be added to the wish list! There is a ROW from Hall Farm to Caenby Corner. Within the village there are ROWs in front of Glentworth Hall and from Hillside, and Harpswell – Glentworth (awaiting reinstatement), plus Glentworth - Fillingham. 10.5 also omits to mention another footpath, similarly in the LCC waiting list for reinstatement, running past Meadowview. That makes a total of 7 ROWs not 4 as claimed.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Largely complete but need to remove "under threat of closure" with reference to the the footpath between Glentworth and Harpswell.
NS25	10	Policy 3 Green Infrastructures	map. The description "natural and semi natural open space" is attributed to woods/spinney/copses?	Natural and semi natural open space have been identified through the "Central Lincolnshire Open Space Audit and Provision Standard Assessment" and the "CLLP Interactive Map".	No change required.
NS26	10	Policy 4 Community Facilities	Why mention Welton, when Kirton is nearer, larger and has more facilities?	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS27	10	Policy 4 Community Facilities	policy 4. Not a single aspiration in this section. GPC has previously tried to obtain a field for ball games for example.	Considered for 'Aspirations' but not critical to the Plan.	No change required.
NS28	10	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	There is only 1 village not plural	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS29	10	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	No mention of any TPO policy, 6.1 alludes but does not follow up at all.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot impact tree preservation orders.	No change required.
NS30	10	Section 5 Reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan	P40 section 5 2nd para. "allocate resources". Ultra vires, this plan cannot so order GPC. It can recommend perhaps.	If the Parish Council instigates a review then it is appropriate that the Parish Council is responsible for providing, either through grant or from other sources, the necessary resources.	No change required.
NS31	10	Section 6 Community Aspirations	item 5 drainage. For the avoidance of doubt, specify which hill because there are two.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended to read "St. George's Hill".
NS32	10	Section 6 Community Aspirations	item 14 maintenance of verges. Who's verges LCC or private, or both?	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Glentworth Parish Council will seek collaboration with both private landowners and public bodies for the active maintenance of verges.
NS33	10	Section 6 Community Aspirations	section 14 St Georges Hill. Definitely NOT an aspiration according to the last public vote in the village held by GPC, in fact quite the opposite. GPC mins refer.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	'Aspirations' has been removed from Section 6.
NS34	11	Local Green Space	Lack of recognition of risk of land at west of Church Street owned by farmer in Fillingham with desire to develop.	This area is too big for green space allocation and has already been afforded a degree of protection by the CLLP.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS35	13	Local Green Space	Lack of recognition of risk of land at west of Church Street owned by farmer in Fillingham with desire to develop.	This area is too big for green space allocation and has already been afforded a degree of protection by the CLLP.	No change required.
NS36	15	Part A	The explanation of the process is not at all clear and the sections on socioeconomic profile and population are incomprehensible.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Sections 1 and 2 have been amended to make them more understandable.
NS37	15	Community Aspirations	Do not support one-way on St. George's Hill	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	'Aspirations' has been removed from Section 6.
NS38	15	Character Profile	Data is OK, presentation is poor	The Working Group believes the Neighbourhood Character Profile Report is a high quality document and that the presentation is of high standard.	No change required.
NS39	20	Part A	Glentworth and the people who live here need to move forward to ensure it remains a inviting and supportive village to all residents young and old.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	No change required.
NS40	23	Part A	I fully support any plans which preserve the character & essential infrastructure of the village, interspersing it with new structures whilst preserving its natural beauty for future generations.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Support noted.
NS41	25	Local Green Space	(1) Rehabilitate pond in front of Glentworth Hall grazing land (3) on map	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Aspiration regarding the rehabilitation of the pond has been added in Section 6.
NS42	25	Green Infrastructure	Would it be possible to have ornamental trees planted along the village's main streets	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Aspiration regarding the planting of ornamental tress has been added in Section 6.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS43	25	Community Aspirations	Improve look of Anglian Water Station	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Aspiration regarding the appearance and maintenance of Anglian Water pumping station has been added to Section 6.
NS44	26	Part A	Keep it a safe rural village for all	Comment noted and agreed with.	No change required.
NS45	29	Part A	Overall Plan is excellent. However, we are disappointed that there is no specific policy that there is a predilection against any form of new housing in people's back gardens.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Specific reference to the development in rear gardens has been added in the Neighbourhood Character Profile Report, reading "Development proposals in rear gardens should be discouraged".
NS46	29	Objectives	Lack of historic objectives (see comments made in Plan) "Protect conservation area", "Ensure views to listed buildings are maintained", "Protect views and line of sight to the escarpment"	The Working Group believes that Policy 3, and in particular 3.1.1, 3.1.4, and 3.1.7, addresses all the points mentioned in the comment.	No change required.
NS47	29	Views and Vistas	Views up to the ridge are all important.	Comment noted.	No change required.
NS48	29	Green Infrastructure	Policy is rather bland. Can't we say more to protect green infrastructures?	The National Planning Policy require the wording of policies to be positive and supportive of good development. The Policy sets requirements for the protection and enhancement of key views, and does not grant automatic support. Decisions are determined on a case by case basis by WLDC Planning Authority, using, amongst other, the provision contained in the Neighbourhood Plan Policies	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS49	29	Broadband Connection	Rather bland. The word "should" should be replaced by the word "will".	The National Planning Policy requires the wording of policies to be positive and supportive of good development. The Policy sets requirements for the protection and enhancement of key views, and does not grant automatic support. Decisions are determined on a case by case basis by WLDC Planning Authority, using, amongst other, the provision contained in the Neighbourhood Plan Policies	No change required.
NS50	29	Design and Character	Point 1 not specific enough. Point 3 - why wooden windows included - some upvc looks very traditional. Biggest issue in this policy is that there's nothing to prevent garden-grabbing.	After review, the Working Group considers the original wording appropriate. Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Specific reference to the development in rear gardens has been added in the Neighbourhood Character Profile Report, reading "Development proposals in rear gardens should be discouraged".
NS51	29	Community Aspirations	Can we prioritise these aspirations through info received via survey?	Section 6 describes the nature of Community Aspirations and why they cannot be prioritized, but simply suggested, as discussion topics for the Glentworth Parish Council to discuss further.	No change required.
NS52	29	8.2	Replace "Steering Group" with "Working Group" throughout the document.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS53	29	5.6	The table is not the correct version	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS54	29	5.7	WLDC Sustainability Screening?	Section 2.1.5. explains the process for the Sustainability Screening Report prepared by WLDC.	No change required.
NS55	29	5.18	Did we contact non-resident landowners??	Non-resident landowner have not been directly consulted due to lack of contact detail.	Remove reference to non-resident landowners from the final consultation step in the process description.
NS56	29	5.21	Change "which has will be submitted" to "which has to be submitted".	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS57	29	Section 2 Glentworth	Change "Grade II* listed building and well known" to "Grade II* listed building is a well known"	Working Group does not believe the amendment to be necessary.	No change required.
NS58	29	Section 2 Glentworth	"Tower" should be above the map.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS59	29	Section 2 Glentworth	Typos - remove full stop after "east from" and replace "The" with "the". Replace "frees" with "trees".	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS60	29	Section 2 Glentworth	We should add in here the field opens the view into the village at the bottom of Hanover Hill.	The Working Group has considered the recommendation, but believes that the current list of views in Policy 1 cover the most important views in the Parish.	No change required.
NS61	29	10.5	"Socio-economic profile" should be a heading.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS62	29	Section 2 Glentworth	Does this make sense?	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS63	29	11.3	Vision - replace "parishes" with "parish's"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS64	29	Objectives	Historic - Protect conservation area	The Working Group believes that Policy 3, and in particular 3.1.1, 3.1.4, and 3.1.7 address all the points mentioned in the comment.	No change required.
NS65	29	6.1	Historic - Ensure views to listed buildings are maintained	The Working Group believes that Policy 3, and in particular 3.1.1, 3.1.4, and 3.1.7 address all the points mentioned in the comment.	No change required.
NS66	29	6.1	Historic - Protect views and line of sight to the escarpment	The Working Group believes that Policy 1 addresses all the points mentioned in the comment.	No change required.
NS67	29	Section 4 Policies	[First sentence] Doesn't make sense	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS68	29	Section 4 Policies	Replace "recognise" with "recognising"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS69	29	Policy 2 Local Green Space	The views up to the ridge are all important	Comment noted.	No change required.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS70	29	Policy 2 Local Green Space	(see map below) - map should be referenced by page number	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS71	29	Policy 2 Local Green Space	[Final sentence] This doesn't make sense without saying what other areas are. Re-write sentence.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Map referred to using the image caption.
NS72	29	Policy 2 Local Green Space	[First sentence] Re-write sentence.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS73	29	Policy 2 Local Green Space	The other cemetery needs adding to the map	Map 4 is based on the 'Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Interactive Map', and hence shows the conclusion of a study that has not been produced by the Working Group.	No change required.
NS74	29	Policy 3 Green Infrastructure	Replace "Local Authorities should planning" with "Local Authorities should plan"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended to remove the sentence.
NS75	29	Policy 3 Green Infrastructure	Replace "component" with "components"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS76	29	Policy 3 Green Infrastructure	Blank paragraph - Remove	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS77	29	Policy 3 Green Infrastructure	Paragraph 10.5 reads poorly. Footpaths and bridleways need listing.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended to list and describe bridleways and footpaths.
NS78	29	Policy 3 Green Infrastructure	Policy Map 3 too small to read. Suggest landscape to ensure scaled-up size.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	The map has been made landscape and amended using the cartographic style employed in "Map 1. Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan Area".
NS79	29	Policy 4 Community Facilities	Replace "event" with "events"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS80	29	Policy 4 Community Facilities	I would also suggest Kirton Lindsey and Glentham as providing shopping and pubs	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS81	29	Policy 4 Community Facilities	Policy Map 4 Could this map be landscape to enlarge scale?	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	The map has been made landscape and amended using the cartographic style employed in "Map 1. Glentworth Neighbourhood Plan Area".
NS82	29	Policy 5 Broadband Connection	"Policy 11"? Should this read "Policy 5"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS83	29	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	Should there be examples of what the responses were?	The consultation process and outcomes are described in detail in the Consultation Statement.	No change required.
NS84	29	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	Insert comma after "Policy LP25"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS85	29	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	Surround "Effect on traffic" with quotation marks.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS86	29	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	Multiple typographical and grammatical errors to be corrected.	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS87	29	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	[Bullet 1] Not very specific -could it be tightened-up?	The specific elements of this bullet point are further analyzed and detailed in the Neighbourhood Character Profile.	No change required.
NS88	29	Policy 6 Design and Character of Development	[Bullet 1] Replace "neighboring" with "neighbouring" and "villages" with "village"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS89	29	1.5	[Bullet 1] Add a comma between "Glentworth" and "characterised"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

Ref.	Respondent	Section of Draft Plan	Comment	Response	Actions
NS90	29	3.1	[Bullet 3] Why wooden windows? Some UPVC windows look very traditional.	After review, the Working Group considers the original wording appropriate.	No change required.
NS91	29	3.2	Replace "which" with "that" and "meets" with "meet"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS92	29	3.4	Can we include somewhere the desire that we don't build in back gardens?	After review, the Working Group considers the original wording appropriate. Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Specific reference to the development in rear gardens have been added in the Neighbourhood Character Profile Report, reading "Development proposals in rear gardens should be discouraged".
NS93	29	3.6	[penultimate bullet] Replace "footback" with "footpath"	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.
NS94	29	4.3	Align final bullet	Comment noted and agreed with suggestion.	Amended as suggested.

