

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish – Our Future – Our Say

2018 - 2031

Consultation Statement

Second Submission Version – 2019

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 2. AIMS OF THE CONSULTATION PROCESS | 3 |
| 3. PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED | 4 |
| 4. METHODS OF COMMUNICATION USED | 4 |
| 5. BACKGROUND TO CONSULTATION | 5 |
| 6. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROCESS | 6 |
| QUESTIONNAIRE (SURVEY) | 6 |
| CONSULTATION EXERCISE OCTOBER 2017 | 7 |
| REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION | 7 |
| REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION | 8 |
| 7. STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT | 9 |
| 8. LIST OF APPENDICES | 10 |

1. Introduction

- 1.1** This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031.
- 1.2** The legal basis of the Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
- Contain details of the people and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan
 - Explain how they were consulted
 - Summarise the main issues and concerns that were raised
 - Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2. Aims of the Consultation Process

- 2.1** The Preston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group recognised that effective communication and community engagement were essential to informing and involving residents in the development of the Plan. Their aims were:
- To produce a community led plan
 - To provide the opportunity for the community to have a real say over local decision making
 - To engage with every household in the parish and to involve young people; to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan is representative of the views of the whole community.

3. People and Organisations Consulted

- 3.1** In addition to parish residents, landowners and businesses were consulted during the early stages of the Neighbourhood Plan preparation.
- 3.2** The Steering Group also engaged other local individuals, groups and organisations that made contributions to the Neighbourhood Plan. These included:
- Frances Drew (listed buildings)
 - Dr Jane Sears (natural environment)
 - Philip Wray (history of Preston)
 - Kate Harwood (Hertfordshire Gardens Trust)
 - North Hertfordshire Museum
 - Hertfordshire Historic Environment Record
 - Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre
 - Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust
- 3.3** Throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Group has kept in close communication with Officers and local Councillors from NHDC. A full list of statutory and non-statutory consultees can be found in Appendix 18.

4. Methods of Communication Used

- 4.1** The mechanisms used to achieve the extensive community engagement sought by the Steering Group are summarised below:
- Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Website www.preston-np.org.uk
 - A dedicated telephone line for residents to contact the Steering Group with queries
 - Updates in the monthly newsletter - Preston Church and Village News
 - Posters on village noticeboards
 - Fliers and a Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire delivered to every household
 - Drop-in sessions, village meetings and events
- 4.2** There were a number of organised consultation events to encourage face-to-face engagement. These were:
- Parish meeting, 26 June 2016
 - Drop-in session, 5 November 2016
 - Presentation of questionnaire findings to Parishioners, 30 April 2017
 - Drop-in sessions, 5 & 7 October 2017
 - Meetings to support Regulation 14 process, 11 & 13 January and 8 & 10 February 2018

5. Background to Consultation

- 5.1 The application for a designated area for a neighbourhood plan for Preston Parish was submitted to North Hertfordshire District Council on 14 March 2016. This was subject to consultation for a period of six weeks and resulted in a number of comments (see Appendix 1). The Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Area was approved at a North Hertfordshire District Council Cabinet meeting on 14 June 2016. An extract from the minutes of the Cabinet meeting is included at Appendix 2.
- 5.2 A parish meeting was held on 26 June 2016 at which five Parish Councillors, the Parish Clerk, two speakers and 28 members of the public were present (see minutes of the meeting on website www.prestonvillageherts.com) Following the Parish meeting the Parish Council asked residents to come forward if they were interested in being part of a Steering Group to guide and produce a Neighbourhood Plan. A Steering Group of local residents met for the first time on 14 July 2016 where they appointed officers and agreed an initial set of actions. Minutes of Steering Group meetings along with a Constitution and Code of Conduct can be found on the [Neighbourhood Plan website](#). They also produced a Project Plan, which is a working document and has been updated as the project progressed (see Appendix 3).
- 5.3 The Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Website has been central to the Neighbourhood Plan communication process. The website has kept residents and other interested parties informed during each phase of the development of the Plan. It contains up to date news, information on developing the plan, all Steering Group papers, minutes of meetings, consultation results, all Neighbourhood Plan documents and contact information.
- 5.4 Updates on progress have also been provided in the free parish newsletter which is hand delivered monthly to all households in the parish, as well as being published on the village website.
- 5.5 The Steering Group has also used posters displayed on notice boards within the Parish and fliers delivered to every household, updates at all Parish Council meetings, drop in sessions to share updates and garner opinions from parishioners and word of mouth to spread news of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
- 5.6 Throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Group has kept in close communication with Officers and local Councillors from NHDC.

6. Community Consultation Process

Questionnaire (Survey)

- 6.1 Between August and December 2016 the main focus was on the development of a comprehensive Questionnaire. During the drafting stage, five key themes emerged: Quality of Life, Amenities and Facilities, Housing and Development, Environment and Heritage and Transport and Communication.
- 6.2 In November 2016 the Insight Fountain was commissioned to review the bespoke questionnaire created by the Steering Group to collect the vital information needed about the things the community wanted to include in their Neighbourhood Plan. This included a Young Residents' Questionnaire. The survey was piloted with young residents and with adults and 21 adults attended the drop-in session.
- 6.3 The survey was hand delivered to every household in the parish in January 2017. Sufficient questionnaires were produced so that every adult 16 years and older and each young person aged 10-15 could fill in their own questionnaire if they wished. Those under 10 years old were invited to draw or write about something that depicted why they liked living in Preston. All three survey forms, [Adults, Young Residents and Under 10's](#) are available to download on the Neighbourhood Plan website.
- 6.4 A great deal of effort was put into achieving the highest level of engagement possible in the survey. A poster and flier advertising the proposed delivery of the questionnaire (see Appendix 4) was followed up by a personal delivery by a team of volunteers to ensure the right number and type of questionnaires were distributed. The Delivery / Collection Record and the Fieldworkers Guide are included in Appendix 5 and 6 respectively. A 'Sorry we missed you!' follow-up flier was left where no one was at home (see Appendix 7).
- 6.5 A team of volunteers collected all questionnaires by 10 February 2017. 150 out of 165 Households took part with a 91% response rate. 302 out of 336 adults took part, giving a 90% individual adult response rate. 24 out of 28 young people took part giving an 86% individual youth response rate. An entry in the monthly Newsletter acknowledged and thanked residents for their responses (see Appendix 8).
- 6.6 The results were analysed during February and March by The Insight Fountain who said "We can be confident that the data is robust and is based on a sample that is representative of the population of Preston in 2017 giving reliable and valid results." In April 2017 the [Report of the Questionnaire Results](#) was completed and printed. This can be accessed on the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk
- 6.7 A meeting was arranged to update residents on the results of the survey and businesses in the parish were asked to express their views. This meeting was publicised online; in the Newsletter item mentioned above; with a poster/flier (see Appendix 9); and via the Parish Council email contact list (with over 100 email addresses) and an email list for the Preston News Service. The Report of Questionnaire Results was presented at a Village Meeting on 30 April 2017. This is included in Appendix 10.

- 6.8** Following the meeting every household in the Parish was given a full copy of the Report delivered in a special envelope (see Appendix 11). One of the purposes of the envelope was to expand the email contact list and residents were asked to provide their email address so that they could be sent a record of the Q and A session held at the end of the meeting. This is attached to the Report of Questionnaire Results mentioned above.

Consultation Exercise October 2017

- 6.9** During the summer the Steering Group worked up a Vision for the Neighbourhood Plan and a comprehensive list of Objectives. A consultation exercise was carried out in the first week of October 2017 to gain the views of residents and landowners on the Vision and Objectives. The Drop-in sessions held on the 5 & 7 October (a weekday evening and a Saturday morning) were publicised in a poster/flier (see Appendix 12), and an entry in the monthly Newsletter (see Appendix 13). An on-line form for replies was also set up on the Neighbourhood Plan website (see screen print Appendix 14) and a specific letter inviting landowners to attend was sent (see Appendix 15).
- 6.10** There were 22 attendees at the drop-in sessions including four members of a local landowning family. Five on-line responses were also received. The comments were collated (see Appendix 16) and a photographic record of the event is included in Appendix 17.
- 6.11** From the extensive consultation carried out above and all the other evidence gathered over the previous year, the Steering Group prepared a draft set of policies with explanatory text and reasoned justification. This draft was reviewed by a local planning consultant, experienced in guiding Town and Parish Councils in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans (Govresources).

Regulation 14 Consultation

- 6.12** The revised draft of the Neighbourhood Plan together with a Basic Conditions Statement was the subject of the Statutory Regulation 14 Consultation, supported by this Consultation Statement. A list of consultees is included in Appendix 18. A sample letter sent to Consultees and the article in the monthly Newsletter publicising the consultation are included in Appendices 19 and 20 respectively.
- 6.13** The Regulation 14 Consultation took place between 8 January and 18 February 2018. This included four drop-in sessions with 36 attendees. Comments were received from a total of 75 individuals and organisations. In addition to the comments which provided support for the Plan, over 120 helpful suggestions were made (Appendices 24 and 25).

- 6.14** The publicity for the Regulation 14 Consultation included contacting parishioners through the Village Newsletter, by email through the Parish Council and Preston News Service email lists, posters throughout the Parish and via the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Website. The website hosted a copy of the draft Plan and a comments form. Hard copies of the draft Plan were also available to borrow and a copy was available in The Red Lion. There was also a telephone line (01462 434403) open daily from 9 am to 8 pm. Four drop in sessions were held in the Village Hall on 11 and 13 January and 8 and 10 February 2018 (two on a Thursday evening and two on a Saturday morning) and the community were encouraged to attend to talk through the draft Plan and ask questions to clarify understanding or to discuss specific issues. Three computer stations with monitors were set up for anyone who wished to run through the draft Plan and complete the comments form there and then. Appendices 21, 22 and 23 illustrate publicity, attendance and acknowledge the support given to the process by local residents.

Regulation 16 Consultation

- 6.15** The 6 week Regulation 16 Consultation, organised by North Herts District Council, took place between May 24 and July 5 2018. The consultation was advertised to parishioners through the Village Newsletter, (Appendix 26) by email through the Parish Council and Preston News Service email lists, posters throughout the Parish and via the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Website. The Neighbourhood Plan, the Consultation Statement and the Basic Conditions Statement were available on the Neighbourhood Plan website with details of how to respond to the Consultation. A hard copy of the Neighbourhood Plan was available to view in the Red Lion during the consultation period.

Second Regulation 16 Consultation

- 6.16** The Neighbourhood Plan was amended as result of the outcomes of the Regulation 16 Consultation which were made available online by NHDC in July 2018. This included liaison by email and face to face meetings with NHDC. It is anticipated that the second 6 week Regulation 16 Consultation, which will be organised by North Herts District Council, will take place between Tuesday 26 February and Monday 8 April 2019. As previously, the consultation will be advertised to parishioners through the Village Newsletter, by email through the Parish Council and Preston News Service email lists, posters throughout the Parish and via the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Website. The Neighbourhood Plan, the Consultation Statement and the Basic Conditions Statement will be available on the Neighbourhood Plan website with details of how to respond to the Consultation. A hard copy of the Neighbourhood Plan will be available to view in the Red Lion during the consultation period.

7. Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 7.1 In January 2018 a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Determination report was commissioned by North Herts District Council which concluded that The Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan is not likely to have significant effects on the environment and therefore a SEA is not required.
- 7.2 Following the revision of the Neighbourhood Plan as a result of the Regulation 16 Consultation, a second Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Determination report was commissioned by North Herts District Council in January 2019.

8. List of Appendices

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Appendix 1 | Representation on Preston Neighbourhood Plan Area Designation | 11 |
| Appendix 2 | Extract from NHDC Cabinet Minutes re Designated Area | 14 |
| Appendix 3 | Project Plan (April 2018 version) | 15 |
| Appendix 4 | Flier advertising questionnaire | 32 |
| Appendix 5 | Delivery – Collection Record for Questionnaire | 34 |
| Appendix 6 | Fieldworkers Guide | 35 |
| Appendix 7 | ‘Sorry we missed you!’ flier | 37 |
| Appendix 8 | Newsletter entry acknowledging returned Questionnaires | 38 |
| Appendix 9 | Poster / Flier advertising Survey Results meeting 30 April 2017 | 39 |
| Appendix 10 | Presentation of Questionnaire Results | 41 |
| Appendix 11 | Envelope for Report of Questionnaire Results | 54 |
| Appendix 12 | Poster /Flier advertising drop-in sessions on Objectives: Oct 17 | 55 |
| Appendix 13 | Newsletter entry for drop-in sessions on Objectives: Oct 17 | 56 |
| Appendix 14 | Screen print of on-line consultation: Objectives Oct 2017 | 57 |
| Appendix 15 | Letter to landowners re drop-in sessions: Oct 2017 | 58 |
| Appendix 16 | Comments on Vision and Objectives | 59 |
| Appendix 17 | Photographic record of drop-in event: Objectives Oct 2017 | 66 |
| Appendix 18 | List of Consultees for Regulation 14 Consultation | 67 |
| Appendix 19 | Sample letter sent to consultees for Regulation 14 Consultation | 69 |
| Appendix 20 | January Newsletter and Website for Regulation 14 (prepared Dec 2017) | 70 |
| Appendix 21 | Regulation 14 Publicity Media (January and February) | 72 |
| Appendix 22 | Regulation 14 Consultation (photographic and screenshot evidence) | 80 |
| Appendix 23 | Regulation 14 Closedown and Thank You Messages | 87 |
| Appendix 24 | Regulation 14 Supportive Comments | 89 |
| Appendix 25 | Regulation 14 Comments and Actions Spreadsheet | 90 |
| Appendix 26 | June 2018 newsletter for Regulation 16 Consultation | 116 |
| Appendix 27 | Regulation 16 Comments and Actions Spreadsheet | 117 |

The above page numbers refer to the page within this Master PDF document not the internal page numbering of each appendix.

Appendix 1

Representations for Preston Neighbourhood Plan

| Applicant | Ref | Representation | Rep Type |
|--|------|---|----------|
| Hertfordshire County Council - Spatial and Land Use Planning (Ms T Carter-Lyons) | 808 | <p>I am writing in response to Preston Parish Council's application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area and provide comments in relation to minerals and waste planning matters.☐</p> <p>With regards to planning history, records do not indicate that there are any minerals or waste planning applications within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Area boundary. The nearest application site to be aware of is located approximately 57m east of the Neighbourhood Plan Area boundary. The site is known as Vicars Grove Pit. Records show that permission was initially granted in 1952 for the extraction of sand and gravel. Various planning applications have been received with permissions granted in relation to extraction and reclamation of landfill site with processing of buried inert waste. Further details relating to previous planning applications can be provided should this be necessary.☐</p> <p>In terms of waste matters, there are no operating waste facilities recorded by the county council within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Area to be aware of at this present time.☐</p> <p>In terms of minerals matters, it should be noted that the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Area is not located within the sand and gravel belt, however it is partially covered to the west by the West of Stevenage - Preston mineral resource block, where there is potential for the extraction of sand and gravel. The extent of this mineral resource block and buffer is shown in the county council's adopted Mineral☐ Consultation Areas, Supplementary Planning Document. This is an area of the county where particular care is needed to prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of sand and gravel resources. In these areas, before planning applications are decided by the district or borough councils, the county council will be given the chance to consider whether the development proposed would lead to unacceptable sterilisation of mineral resources. Minerals Policy 5: Sterilisation, of the adopted Minerals Local Plan 2002-2016 addresses the need for prior extraction of minerals to ensure that the resource is not sterilised.☐</p> <p>In addition, it is worth pointing out that the buffer of an adjacent mineral resource block partially falls within the Neighbourhood Plan Area on the eastern boundary. This mineral resource block is known as West of Stevenage - Langley.☐</p> <p>It should be noted, when the Parish Council develops its vision and objectives for shaping development and growth within the neighbourhood, that minerals and waste matters will need to be taken into account as Minerals and Waste Local Plans form part of the Development Plan. These are as follows:☐</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐, Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document 2011-2026, adopted November 2012; ☐, Waste Site Allocations document 2011-2026, adopted July 2014; & ☐, Minerals Local Plan 2002-2016, adopted March 2007. <p>New development and growth of an area results in the generation of waste and this will be an important aspect needing consideration in due course, in addition to the need to avoid the sterilisation of minerals, as known to be present within the Mineral Resource Block.☐</p> <p>The county council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority would like to be consulted at future stages in the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | Comment |
| Environment Agency (Ms Georgina Howell) | 852 | <p>Thank you for consulting us on the application for Knebworth's neighbourhood plan area. ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>As it relates to the area designation, we have no comments to make at this stage. ☐</p> | Comment |
| Mr and Mrs Andy and Jane Cole | 5822 | We are pleased to confirm that we fully support the Preston Parish Councils application for a Neighbourhood Plan for this Parish. | Support |
| Mr & Mrs Mike & Susan Kellard | 5888 | We fully support the decision of Preston Parish Council to engage in the Neighbourhood Planning process. We agree that the designated area chosen for the preparation of the Plan (by the Parish Council) is appropriate. | Support |
| Mrs Doreen M Sansom | 5901 | I support the application by Preston Parish Council for a Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area. | Support |

Representations for Preston Neighbourhood Plan

| Applicant | Ref | Representation | Rep Type |
|--|-------|---|----------|
| Miss Caroline Walford | 6193 | Please be kind enough to register my personal approval of this application. | Support |
| Mr Alexander Bierrum | 6197 | I support the Preston Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area delineating the whole Parish. | Support |
| Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (Mrs Kate Harwood) | 6204 | <p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on this application for the Preston Neighbourhood Area.☺</p> <p>HGT has researched many of the historic landscapes in the area, including the Grade II* Registered Temple Dinsley. There are two further sites, unregistered, which we have not researched but which may be of local historic interest. These surround 2 houses by Lucas, the well known Arts & Crafts architect. Plans for several of his houses include Arts and Crafts gardens. These two sites, Offley Holes and Poynders End both had small areas of parkland: Poynders End park appears on the 1922 Ordnance Survey map and the Offley Holes parkland is noted at 50 acres in 1821 by Hugh prince in his book Parks in Hertfordshire since 1500. ☺</p> <p>HGT would be happy to give any assistance required in assessing the heritage values of the historic designed landscape, parks and gardens, required during the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | Comment |
| Mr Robert Challans | 6206 | Please be advised that I support the Preston Neighbourhood Plan | Support |
| Mrs Ita C Leaver | 6215 | This is to let you know I support the application for a Neighbourhood Plan for Preston. | Support |
| Mr John Maude | 6242 | With reference to the proposed plan for the Preston Neighbourhood we would like to advise that we agree entirely with this proposal which indicates very clearly the area enclosed within the red line where no further development should take place in the future. This is to fully protect the integrity of the wild life and ensure no consequent damage to this area of outstanding natural beauty. | Support |
| Mrs Elizabeth Maude | 6243 | With reference to the proposed plan for the Preston Neighbourhood we would like to advise that we agree entirely with this proposal which indicates very clearly the area enclosed within the red line where no further development should take place in the future. This is to fully protect the integrity of the wild life and ensure no consequent damage to this area of outstanding natural beauty. | Support |
| The Preston Trust (Mr Richard Coles) | 6248 | I am writing on behalf of The Preston Trust which has a large number of Preston residents as members. The Preston Trust is a registered charity with the following objectives:☺ | Support |
| St Ippolyts Parish Council (Mrs Susan Mears) | 12728 | St Ippolyts Parish Council agreed at 16th May Parish Council Meeting to support this application to designate the "Preston Neighbourhood Area" with view to developing a Neighbourhood Plan. | Support |
| Mr Robert Altham | 13261 | <p>I support Preston Parish Councils application.☺</p> <p>As a local landowner my family supports the local parish council making decisions about the future of this village.</p> | Support |
| Mr Robert Altham | 13261 | I agreed that the parish council should be looking at the whole parish when making neighbour hood plans. Preston is a desirable place to live but there has been too much in- filling and garden grabbing and the houses are becoming hemmed in and cramped with smaller and smaller spaces being built upon. Time for some new space with good access to be used for building. | Support |
| Mr Ken Anderson | 13296 | I fully support the local area plan for Preston | Support |
| Mrs Fay Higgin | 13297 | I wish to support the Parish Councils desire to create a Neighbourhood Plan | Support |

Representations for Preston Neighbourhood Plan

| Applicant | Ref | Representation | Rep Type |
|----------------|-------|---|----------|
| Ms Ann Kendall | 13414 | I support the introduction of a Neighbourhood Plan for the whole parish of Preston. | Support |

Appendix 2

Extract from NHDC Cabinet Minutes

Date: Tuesday, 14th June, 2016

Time: 7.30pm

Place: Council Chamber, Council Offices, Gernon Road, Letchworth Garden City

KNEBWORTH AND PRESTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING AREAS

Report

Appendix 1 - Map of the area to be designated as the Knebworth Neighbourhood Planning Area

Appendix 2 - Map of the area to be designated as the Preston Neighbourhood Planning Area

Appendix 3.1 - Application Letter from Knebworth Parish Council

Appendix 3.2 - Map from Knebworth Parish Council

Appendix 4.1 - Application Letter from Preston Parish Council

Appendix 4.2 - Map from Preston Parish Council

Appendix 5 - Schedule of Representations from Knebworth

Appendix 6 - Schedule of Representations from Preston

The Executive Member for Planning and Enterprise presented a report of the Strategic Director of Planning, Housing and Enterprise in respect of the proposed Knebworth and Preston Neighbourhood Planning Areas. The following appendices were submitted with the report:

Appendix 1 - Map of the area to be designated as the Knebworth Neighbourhood Plan Area;

Appendix 2 - Map of the area to be designated as the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Area;

Appendix 3 - Application Letter and map from Knebworth Parish Council;

Appendix 4 - Application Letter and map from Preston Parish Council;

Appendix 5 - Schedule of representations for Knebworth; and

Appendix 6 - Schedule of representations for Preston.

The Executive Member for Planning and Enterprise explained that the Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 had amended the way in which the local planning authority must determine an application for the designation of a neighbourhood planning area. Once a local planning authority had received an application, it must publicise it for not less than four weeks after the application was publicised on its website and invite comments. Once the application had been publicised, the local planning authority must determine the application within eight weeks.

The Executive Member for Planning and Enterprise stated that the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Areas for Preston and Knebworth followed their respective Parish boundaries, and hence he recommended that the designations be approved.

RESOLVED: That, having regard to the representations made, the designation of the Neighbourhood Areas for Knebworth and Preston, as detailed in Paragraph 8.2 of the report and Appendices 1 (Knebworth) and 2 (Preston) respectively, be approved.

REASON FOR DECISION: To allow Knebworth and Preston Parish Councils to formally prepare a neighbourhood plan for their respective Parishes.

Project Plan

Version as file name: Appendix 3 Project Plan v0g

This Project Plan is a living document - as such elements in future versions may refer to increasing numbers of activities in the past tense.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Table of Contents..... | 2 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Key to Initials and Abbreviations used in this document | 3 |
| Scope and Requirements | 3 |
| Roles & Responsibilities | 3 |
| The Steering Group | 4 |
| The Working Groups | 4 |
| Sub-ordinate Plans | 4 |
| Communication Plan | 4 |
| Configuration Management and Data Management Plan..... | 4 |
| Risk & Issue Management Plan..... | 4 |
| Working Group Plans | 5 |
| Timetable | 6 |
| Flow Chart with Timeline | 6 |
| Our Steps and Stages (with estimated duration of each stage) | 7 |
| 1. Get Started (5-7 weeks) | 7 |
| 2. Apply for designation of a neighbourhood area (Done) | 8 |
| 3. Apply to establish our neighbourhood forum (13-22 weeks)..... | 9 |
| 4. Define Desired Outcome(s) (20-31 weeks) | 10 |
| 5. Develop our Plan (35-54 weeks) | 11 |
| 6. Obtain an Independent Examination (20-33 weeks) | 13 |
| 7. Conduct a Referendum (8-13 weeks or more if arranging exceeds 8 weeks) | 14 |
| 8. Final Plan Decision | 14 |
| Document History | 14 |
| Appendices..... | 16 |
| Information Referenced..... | 16 |

Introduction

This is a living document reflecting the current understanding of the project plan (including high level schedule) as it evolves. The plan will be maintained and executed in compliance with the Constitution and Code of Conduct of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Key to Initials and Abbreviations used in this document

| | |
|------|---|
| DD | Diane Day |
| MG | Malcolm Gomm |
| AH | Alexandra Higgin |
| FH | Fay Higgin |
| LH | Liz Hunter |
| RR | Rae Reynolds |
| MT | Margaret Trinder |
| WS | Wally Steele |
| BL | Becky Lewis – Insight Fountain |
| CS | Clare Skeels - NHDC Town Planning Department |
| HERC | Herts Environmental Records Centre |
| NHDC | Local Planning Authority – North Herts District Council |
| PC | Preston Parish Council |
| SG | Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group |

Scope and Requirements

The Primary requirement is to produce a Neighbourhood Plan that reflects the needs and wants of the parishioners.

The scope has been defined and refined by the Survey and other consultations - within the constraints of our Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area, emerging Local Plan, NPPF and planning laws.

Roles & Responsibilities

Formal Roles

Chairman - Chair Meetings and provide central co-ordination for team decision making

Vice-Chairman - To stand in for Chairman at need.

Parish Council Liaison - Communicate progress and issues to Parish Council, advise on Parish Council requirements, interface with government bodies as a Parish Councillor on behalf of the Steering Group.

Clerk - Keep the project archive and minutes.

Responsibilities

The roles were and are kept fluid and managed via steering group meetings and e-mail communication. See Steering Group Minutes.

The Steering Group

- Wally Steele (Chairman)
- Margaret Trinder (Parish Councillor and Liaison)
- Di Day (Vice Chair)
- Fay Higgin (Clerk)
- Malcolm Gomm
- Alexandra Higgin (resigned to avoid work related conflict of interest)
- Liz Hunter
- Rae Reynolds

The Working Groups

The scope of the Parish and necessary Neighbourhood Plan did not need any formal Working Groups. Dr. Jane Sears provided environmental research, while Frances Drew catalogued the Built Environment. Elizabeth Hunter with Malcolm Gomm is documenting the Natural and Built Environment Settings.

Sub-ordinate Plans

The minutes of Steering Group meetings have been and still are proving sufficient for planning of sub-ordinate "mini-projects" such as the Survey and other consultations.

Communication Plan

Publicity has been and will be via:

- The Neighbourhood Plan website www.preston-np.org.uk
- Fliers delivered to the doorstep
- Posters displayed on notice boards in the parish
- Parish Newsletter - delivered to every household in the parish
- Preston News Service - a free subscription e-mail list
- Parish Council e-mail distribution List - a free subscription e-mail list.

The Steering Group can be contacted via:

- a dedicated phone number (01462 434 403) - which can be diverted to team
- direct communication with any Steering Group member
- e-mail via a contact form on the Neighbourhood Plan website
- the Parish Council.

Configuration Management and Data Management Plan

The archive of physical documents (including printed copies of electronic documents) is kept by the Steering Group Clerk.

When the Neighbourhood Plan is made the archive will be transferred to the Parish Council.

Version control and configuration management is on a document by document basis by the lead author until published.

Risk & Issue Management Plan

Insurance for public liability is covered by the Parish Council.

Risks that might affect progress towards delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan have been amenable to informal management through Steering Group meetings and e-mail communication. This is expected to continue. Hence no formal plan is required.

Working Group Plans

Working groups have, so far, proved unnecessary hence there are no plans to reference.


Timetable

This section indicates sequencing and duration estimates of the stages and high level activities. After researching various materials available on the internet the timetable was based on “The stages of a Neighbourhood Plan” from Chichester District Council, which had 7 stages. This was supplemented with information from the Cornwall Council’s “The stages of a Neighbourhood Plan” and Pirton’s Neighbourhood Plan website. Actions arising from the first Steering Group meeting minutes are incorporated in our “Stage 1. Get Started”.

Regulations refer to Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 – There is a 2015 amendment which affects duration of some statutory phases that will be incorporated into a later version of this plan.

Flow Chart with Timeline

Inspired by a document from Brighton & Hove City Council, this is based on estimates (in separate Excel document) from our Steps and Stages detailed in this section. It gives a range estimate of the time required to complete each stage and the overall project.



Our Steps and Stages (with estimated duration of each stage)

| Stage | Steps/Tasks and contextual information to consider | Action / Owner | Status |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Get Started (5-7 weeks) | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involve the community in deciding if a Neighbourhood Plan is wanted | Public consultation | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate Preston Neighbourhood Plan Project | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, with initial roles and responsibilities | Engage volunteers | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce contact list for Volunteers and for SG | MT | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce skills list for Volunteers (including SG) | MT | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce a programme/ timetable for developing the Neighbourhood Plan | RR + WS | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draw up a list of those to be consulted | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement communication and data management strategies to carry out the consultation Develop NP Website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate Domain Names (URL) and availability Investigate website hosting and development options Set up website (technology and graphic design) Create initial web content Implement Data Protection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enquire about data protection for the Steering Group Register for Data protection - <i>covered by PC</i> Set up Document Repository / Shared Workspace <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate free or inexpensive technologies - <i>Wordpress is appropriate for both our website and document repository</i> | WS WS WS SG MT MT WS | Done Done Done Done Done Done Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide number of dwellings in the Parish for the newsletter and future use | MT | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a flyer for September newsletter Draft Text <p><i>Survey and hence flier postponed as questionnaires needed significantly more work than estimated</i></p> | FH+LH | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Survey for Preston <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionnaires Select and engage analyst Publicity Campaign | | Done Done Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put Survey in the field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Print Questionnaires Set up fieldworkers Manage fieldwork | | Done Done Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse Survey and share initial results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis and draft report Publish and distribute report Present results | BL+SG WS+RR DD+MT+WS | Done Done Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create Project Governance Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constitution Code of Conduct Vision Statement | DD DD DD | Done Done Done |

Project Plan for Development of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look at how to fund the plan and manage finances Ask Parish Council to manage the Steering Group receipts and payments Apply to Parish Council for initial funding Preparation for Grant Application Investigate how to apply Estimate likely items and costs for grant funding | DD | Done |
| | | DD | Done |
| | | RR | Done |
| | | RR | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish which Planning Authorities to submit our neighbourhood area application to. | PC | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation for Subsequent Stages Contact Di Burleigh about using Pirton's material and documents Produce initial list of names and associations who may be able to provide help on aspects of the plan Adapt Pirton Questionnaire | MT | Done |
| | | MT | Done |
| 2. Apply for designation of a neighbourhood area | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define the Neighbourhood Plan area and submit an application and map of the area to the Local Planning Authority (Regulation 5) In our case NHDC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Application must include a map which identifies the area to which the neighbourhood area application relates</i> <i>b) Application must include a statement explaining why area is considered appropriate to be designated as a neighbourhood area</i> <i>c) Application must include a statement that body making area application is a relevant body in accordance with legislation (61G of 1990 Act* as amended by Localism Act 2011)</i> | PC | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit details of the Neighbourhood area proposal to NHDC | PC | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHDC to publicise the following on their website and elsewhere as appropriate (Regulation 6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) a copy of area application</i> <i>b) details of how to make representations</i> <i>c) deadline for receipt of representations (minimum of 6 week period – note amended by 2015 regulation)</i> | NHDC | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval or refusal of designation <p>As soon as possible after designation, NHDC must publicise the following on website and elsewhere as appropriate (Regulation 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) name of the neighbourhood area</i> <i>b) map identifying the area</i> <i>c) name of relevant body applying for designation</i> | NHDC | Approved in Cabinet June 2016 |

Project Plan for Development of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|--|---|---|--------|
| | As soon as possible, if refusing the designation, NHDC must publicise the following on their website and elsewhere as appropriate <i>(a) a decision document setting out statement of reasons for the decision</i> <i>(b) details of where and when decision document can be seen</i> | NHDC | N/A |
| | • If designation refused revisit this stage, otherwise continue to next stage. | SG | N/A |
| 3. Apply to establish our neighbourhood forum (13-22 weeks) Not Applicable | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply for designation of a neighbourhood forum (Regulation 8) <i>Where a body submits a neighbourhood forum application to the local planning authority, it must include</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>name of proposed neighbourhood forum</i> b) <i>a copy of written constitution of proposed neighbourhood forum</i> c) <i>name of neighbourhood area and a map identifying area</i> d) <i>contact details of at least one member of proposed neighbourhood forum</i> e) <i>statement of how proposed neighbourhood forum meets relevant legislation (61F of 1990 Act as amended by Localism Act 2011)</i> | PC Confirmed this stage not required as we have a Parish Council | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicise the neighbourhood forum application (Regulation 9) <i>As soon as possible after receiving a neighbourhood forum application, the local planning authority must publicise the following on their website and elsewhere as appropriate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>a copy of application</i> b) <i>a statement that if a designation is made, no other body may be designated for that neighbourhood area until designation expires or is withdrawn</i> c) <i>details of how to make representations</i> d) <i>deadline for receipt of representations (minimum of 6 week period)</i> | NHDC | |

Project Plan for Development of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|---|--|----------------|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicise the designation of our neighbourhood forum (Regulation 10) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> As soon as possible after designating a neighbourhood forum, a local planning authority must publicise the following on their website and elsewhere as appropriate <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the name of the neighbourhood forum a copy of the written constitution of the neighbourhood forum the name of the neighbourhood area to which designation relates contact details of at least one member of the neighbourhood forum As soon as possible after deciding to refuse a designation, local planning authority must publicise the following on their website and elsewhere as appropriate <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a refusal statement setting out decision and reasons for the decision details of where and when refusal statement can be seen | NHDC | |
| | | | |
| 4. Define Desired Outcome(s) (20-31 weeks) | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gather available evidence (e.g from NHDC and other organisations) | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build our own evidence base | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionnaire – Issue, collect and analyse | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Knowledge Interviews | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other working group activities | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft high level outcomes our community wants from the Neighbourhood Plan | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft character assessment, to hold analysis of Preston Parish, from our evidence base | Not Required | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check for conformity with National and District level policy | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult the community on the draft documents, noting feedback | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisit this stage if needed to address feedback and issues | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check with NHDC if we need a Sustainability Appraisal scoping report? | | Done |
| | | | |

Project Plan for Development of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|--|--|--|--------|
| 5. Develop our Plan (35-54 weeks) | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the desired outcomes define the issues and develop the objectives that the plan will address | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal (if required) in conjunction with the draft Neighbourhood Plan | | N/A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop draft planning policies to deliver objectives | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin writing our consultation statement | | Done |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult the community and stakeholders on the draft Neighbourhood Plan | Based on response to Objectives proceeding to Regulation 14 consultation | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the draft Neighbourhood Plan in response to consultation | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal pre submission consultation. (Regulation 14) <i>Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, the qualifying body must</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>publicise in an appropriate manner in the neighbourhood area</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <i>details of the proposals in a neighbourhood development plan</i> (ii) <i>details of where and when proposals for neighbourhood development plan can be seen</i> (iii) <i>details of how to make representations</i> (iv) <i>deadline for receipt of representations (minimum of 6 week period)</i> b) <i>consult relevant consultation bodies that may be affected by neighbourhood development plan</i> c) <i>send a copy of proposals for neighbourhood development plan to local planning authority</i> | SG | |

Project Plan for Development of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|-------|---|----------------|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit the proposed plan to NHDC (Regulation 15) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority, it must include</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>a map or statement identifying the proposed neighbourhood plan area</i> b) <i>a consultation statement</i> c) <i>the proposed neighbourhood development plan; and</i> d) <i>a statement explaining how the proposed neighbourhood development plan meets the relevant legislation (para 8 of SCHEDULE 4B of 1990 Act as inserted Localism Act, set out in schedule 10)</i> 2. <i>A consultation statement means a document that</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>contains details of persons and bodies consulted about plan</i> b) <i>explains how they were consulted</i> c) <i>summarises main issues raised by consultees</i> d) <i>describes how issues have been considered and where relevant addressed in proposed neighbourhood development plan</i> | SG | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHDC publish and consult draft Neighbourhood Plan with community and stakeholders for a minimum of six weeks (Regulation 16) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>As soon as possible after receiving a plan proposal that includes all of the relevant documents, the local planning authority must</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>publicise the following on their website and elsewhere as appropriate</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) details of the plan proposal (ii) details of where and when the plan proposal can be seen (iii) details of how to make representations (iv) a statement that representations may include a request to be notified of local planning authority's decision under Regulation 19 below (v) deadline for receipt of representations (minimum 6 week period) b) <i>notify any consultation body referred to in the consultation statement that the plan proposal has been received</i> | NHDC | |
| | | | |

Project Plan for Development of the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|---|--|----------------|--------|
| 6. Obtain an Independent Examination (20-33 weeks) | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree selection of independent examiner with NHDC | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint an independent examiner and submit the Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 17) <p>As soon as possible after appointment of a person to carry out an examination, the local planning authority must send the following to the person appointed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) the plan proposal</i> <i>b) the other plan proposal documents referred to in Regulation 15(1) submitted to the local planning authority</i> <i>c) information relating to Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations if relevant</i> <i>d) a copy of any representations made (Regulation 16)</i> | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examination <p><i>The examination can take approximately 1 to 2 months, with an extra additional month if a hearing is required.</i></p> | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of the examiner's report and plan proposal decisions (Regulation 18) <p>Independent Examiner's report published (e.g. on NHDC website) and decision statement sent to the Parish Council and anyone who has previously made a representation</p> | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHDC considers Independent Examiner's report who have asked to be notified of the decision. (Regulation 18) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Local planning authority can decide</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) to decline to consider a plan proposal</i> <i>b) to refuse a plan proposal</i> <i>c) what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner regarding a neighbourhood plan</i> <i>d) what modifications if any they are to make to the draft plan</i> <i>e) whether to extend the area to which a referendum is to take place</i> <i>f) that they are not satisfied with the plan proposal</i> <i>2. As soon as possible after making a decision referred to above, a local planning authority must publish on their website and elsewhere as appropriate</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) the decision and their reasons (the decision statement)</i> <i>b) details of where and when the decision statement may be inspected</i> <i>c) the report made by the examiner</i> | | |
| | | | |

| Stage | Steps/Tasks <i>and contextual information to consider</i> | Action / Owner | Status |
|--|---|----------------|--------|
| 7. Conduct a Referendum (8-13 weeks or more if arranging exceeds 8 weeks) | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHDC will co-ordinate and pay for the referendum which will normally be open to any individual registered to vote in the parish. The referendum will be organised by NHDC's electoral team in much the same way as a Local Election. <p><i>The referendum itself will be a one day event however the regulations stipulate that 28 days' notice needs to be given for the referendum.</i></p> | | |
| | | | |
| 8. Final Plan Decision | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision on a plan proposal (Regulation 19) <p><i>As soon as possible after deciding to make a neighbourhood development plan (or refusing to make a plan), a local planning authority must</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>publish on their website and elsewhere as appropriate</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a statement setting out the decision and their reasons (the decision statement)</i> <i>details of where and when the decision statement may be inspected</i> <i>send a copy of the decision statement to</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the qualifying body</i> <i>any person who asked to be notified of the decision</i> | NHDC | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicising a neighbourhood development plan (Regulation 19) <p><i>As soon as possible after making a neighbourhood development plan, a local planning authority must</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>publish on their website and elsewhere as appropriate</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the neighbourhood development plan</i> <i>details of where and when the neighbourhood development plan may be inspected</i> <i>notify any persons who asked to be notified of the making of the neighbourhood development plan that it has been made and where and when it may be inspected</i> | NHDC | |
| | | | |

Document History

First Draft – version 0b3, circulated 01-08-16

Second Draft – version 0c1, circulated 18-08-16

The version executed from before the first Drop in Session up to and including preparing the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for review and advice by the Steering Group's selected Independent Consultant.

Revisions:

- Clarified definition of Parishioners under “Scope and Requirements”
- Confirmed Stage 2 done as designation of a neighbourhood area was approved in Cabinet June 2016
- Confirmed Stage 3 not required since we have a Parish Council
- Updated Flow Chart to reflect that Stage 3 not required

Working Draft – v0d, minor changes – not circulated

Third Draft – version 0e0, circulated <tbd>

Updated to reflect changes in the plan, composition of the steering group and aspects from the previous version which were unnecessary or simpler than originally estimated.

Appendices

Information Referenced

Cornwall Council - Neighbourhood Planning Process Timetable

Doc Name: NP-Process-Timetable.pdf

URL: <http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/3632474/NP-Process-Timetable.pdf>

Chichester District Council - The stages of a Neighbourhood Plan

Doc Name: Guide_to_producing_a_Neighbourhood_Plan.pdf

URL: <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21951&p=0>

Brighton&Hove City Council - Indicative Neighbourhood Plan Timetable Flow Chart

Doc Name: Neighbourhood Plan Indictv Timetable Flow Chrt v1.pdf

URL: <https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/sites/brighton-hove.gov.uk/files/Neighbourhood%20Plan%20Indictv%20Timetable%20Flow%20Chrt%20v1.pdf>

East Northamptonshire Council –

Neighbourhood Planning Protocol

Doc Name: Final_Neighbourhood_Planning_Protocol.pdf

URL: http://www.east-northamptonshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/5708/neighbourhood_planning_protocol

Neighbourhood Planning Timetable

Doc Name: Final_Neighbourhood_Planning_Protocol.pdf

URL: http://www.east-northamptonshire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/7309/neighbourhood_planning_timetable.pdf

House of Commons Library – Briefing Paper 05838

Doc Name: SN05838.pdf

URL: <http://www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05838.pdf>

Pirton's Neighbourhood Plan Website

URL: <http://pirtonneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/>

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015

Doc Name: ukxi_20150020_en.pdf

URL: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/20/pdfs/uksi_20150020_en.pdf

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

The New Year has arrived and your Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire is on its way...

We would like to bring your questionnaire
to you during the weekend of
14th/15th of January.




The 2012 Localism Act gives all communities the legal right and opportunity to prepare their own Neighbourhood Plan. Such a plan sets out policies to guide development and the use of land in a parish or a neighbourhood. It can also cover: transport, traffic and communications - community facilities - business - our environment and heritage.

The Neighbourhood Plan is your chance to shape how our parish evolves. Once approved by our local authority, NHDC, the plan becomes part of the statutory planning process.

That's why our Neighbourhood Plan is so important!

find out more on our website at www.preston-np.org.uk



The Parish of Preston has seen history made within its boundaries. From John Bunyan preaching, in Wain Wood, in the dead of night to avoid detection, the Knights Templar being resident at Temple Dinsley (now Princess Helena College) to being the proud owners of the first ever community pub and changing BT's model for Rural Broad Band.

During the weekend of 14th/15th January we would like to bring you The Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire. Your answers will create a sound evidence base from which to develop and justify the plan. This will help shape the future of our Parish, in time becoming another part of Preston's rich history!

A representative of the Steering Group will supply your household with Adult and Young Resident Questionnaires. There will also be a sheet for our 'under 10s' if they would like to be involved. The representative will call back at the end of January to collect completed questionnaires.

If you are not available, for either delivery or collection, a representative will call back during the following week. Alternatively you can contact the Steering Group on 01462 434 403, or via the enquiry form on our website at www.preston-np.org.uk, to arrange a convenient time.

There are a number of businesses in the Parish. The questionnaire is for residents, but we are also interested in the views you may hold from a business perspective. Please contact us (as above) to have your say or arrange to meet a member of the Steering Group.

We would also like to invite you to a 'Drop In' Session on Saturday 21st of January at The Village Hall from 10am to 11am. Members of the Steering Group will be there to answer any queries you have on the questionnaire or to chat about the Neighbourhood Plan in general.

We look forward to working with you all and wish you a happy 2017,

Alexandra, Di, Fay, Liz, Margaret, Rae and Wal

your Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

find out more on our website at www.preston-np.org.uk

Appendix 5

Survey Area:

[illegible]

Appendix 6

Additional information to help answer questions

Introduction and a guide to the Questionnaire - The adult resident questionnaire has an Introduction to Neighbourhood Plans on page 4 and a guide to the survey process on page 5.

Survey Help – is available to answer any queries:

- Come to the drop in session at the Village Hall on Saturday 21st January between 10 - 11 am
- Phone our helpline on 01462 434 403
- E-mail us at survey-help@preston-np.org.uk
- Visit the website at www.preston-np.org.uk and follow the link for survey help.

This is also shown on the back of both adult and young resident questionnaires.

Is what I say confidential? (From page 5 of the Adult Questionnaire)

What you say will be analysed statistically for multiple choice and some open (free text) questions. Who said what to these questions will be treated in confidence.

Other open questions will be read to identify themes and issues – useful phrases may be taken from answers to illustrate a theme or issue in the report. The research team will not identify who said what, but it is always possible that the identity of somebody can be guessed because of what they wrote.

Your completed questionnaire will be seen only by the research team - with the following two exceptions:

1. If you have any issues you would like to discuss with the Steering Group please email or fill in the inside back sheet (page 27). The Steering Group will read what you have said on that sheet (page 27) in full.
2. If you mark up the map in Question E4 (page 18) with any additional views, page 18 may be copied to the Steering Group for additional analysis

The research team will not identify who filled in pages 18 and 27 to the Steering Group.

We are asking for your postcode and other demographic details (such as gender and age) so that we can check we have spoken to people from across the community. Where we report on sub groups (such as women or people who work at home) it will only be if it applies to several people in the parish and no one person is identifiable.

The Insight Fountain and We Work With Data are members of the Market Research Society (MRS) and abide by the MRS code of conduct. They are both registered as a data controller with the Information Commissioners Office (ICO) and have carried out Neighbourhood Plan Surveys previously.

Notes for Delivering Questionnaires

This is a quick reference and reminder of what you should have, the process for delivering questionnaires and some supporting information in case of questions.

What you should have

- This set of Notes
- Adult, Young Resident and Under 10's questionnaires.
- One or more forms for recording delivery/collection for your area and a couple of pens
- Numbered envelopes – with numbers matching those on your delivery/collection form(s) - Shortened to D/C Forms throughout
- Blank envelopes
- Calling cards to say “We tried to deliver your questionnaire(s)…”

What to say to residents when you call

Please explain (as appropriate) that:

- There are different questionnaires for different age groups and that everyone who lives in the parish – including lodgers, temporary residents and those working or studying away from home – is allowed to have a questionnaire.
- Participating in the survey is completely voluntary.
- Adult and Young Residents' answers are anonymous. This is stated on page 2 of both questionnaires and explained on page 5 of the adult questionnaire. See extract from page 5 for this text and details of the possible exceptions.
- Any under 10 who wants their writing or drawing on the website has the choice of whether they want to be anonymous or sign their work (subject to parental/guardian consent).
- We plan to collect the weekend of the 28th/29th January. Alternatively:
 - You can make a note on the D/C form of any special requirements
 - Residents can contact survey-help to make other arrangements
 - They can also return questionnaires at the drop in session on 21st January.
 - Residents can post their envelopes (at their own cost) to:

Becky Lewis
The Insight Fountain
101 Longcroft Lane
Welwyn Garden City
AL8 6EL

What to do (the process for delivering)

If there is a resident (16 or over) available

CONFIRM how many of each questionnaire to leave:

- One adult questionnaire for each resident aged 16 years and over (including any lodgers, temporary residents, etc.)
- One young resident questionnaire for each resident aged 10 to 15 years
- An Under 10 sheet and a blank sheet of paper (already paper clipped together) for each resident aged 9 years or younger in case they would like to be involved

CHECK if there are any adults who are studying or working away from home. If this is the case, for each adult who is away:

- ask the person you are talking to, if they would address one of your blank envelopes for us to post a questionnaire
- offer to return with a questionnaire pack ready for them to address and post themselves (*Note we are saying this since not everyone will want to hand out another person's address*)

In either case we will pay the postage and provide a stamped addressed envelope for return of the questionnaire.

GIVE the resident the numbered envelope allocated to their address as well as the appropriate questionnaires.

If there are too many questionnaires to fit in one envelope, put the same envelope number on as many blank envelopes as needed. *See the Ready Reckoner for number of envelopes needed*

Note down on your delivery/collection form:

- how many of each questionnaire you have left (excluding ones to post)
- if we have to return with questionnaire packs or they have addressed envelopes for us (and how many)
- the number of envelopes supplied
- the date
- If they intend to post their completed questionnaires or any other special requirements

Envelope Ready Reckoner

| | | Number of Adult Residents | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Number of Young Residents | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| | 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |

The number of envelopes needed is shown where the column for number of adult residents meets the row for number of young residents.

If no resident is home

On your first visit leave a "We tried to deliver..." card and record it on your D/C Form. If you/we have tried several times and still nobody is home write an "N" and the number of visits in the "Other" column on your D/C Form.

If the residents do not want to take part

Write a "D" in the "Other" column on your D/C Form.

If the Property is Empty

Write an "E" in the "Other" column on your D/C Form.

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish – Our Future – Our Say

We tried to deliver your Questionnaire(s) today

In order to deliver the right number of each type of questionnaire our volunteers need to speak to you, so they will call back. Alternatively, please contact us if you would like to:

- arrange a mutually convenient time for a volunteer to visit, or
- discuss how many of each type you need and a safe place where you would like them left – the questionnaires are A4 size so they may not fit through some letter boxes.

Phone: 01462 434 403

e-mail: survey-help@preston-np.org.uk

Web contact form: www.preston-np.org.uk and follow the “Contact the Steering Group” link.



Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish – Our Future – Our Say

We tried to collect your Questionnaire(s) today

Sorry we missed you. One of our team will call again for your completed questionnaires. Please contact us if you would like:

- a little more time to finish your questionnaire
- to tell us when it would be convenient to come back or arrange a time and place for you to return your envelope(s).

Phone: 01462 434 403

e-mail: survey-help@preston-np.org.uk

Web contact form: www.preston-np.org.uk and follow the “Contact the Steering Group” link.



Appendix 8

Extract from Preston Parish Newsletter: March 2017

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN QUESTIONNAIRES

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group would like to thank Preston residents most sincerely for completing and returning their questionnaires. There has been a remarkable return of 98.1% of envelopes which shows how much all of us care about our parish and our future. The Steering Group would also like to thank everyone who helped to deliver and collect questionnaires, as well as the newsletter team who provided valuable help in organising the rounds. The help of these volunteers made the delivery and collection of questionnaires much easier and quicker.

The questionnaires have now gone to the market researcher for detailed analysis. The outcomes will be presented to local residents as soon as possible. Please look out for a flier with the April newsletter giving details of when this will take place.

Survey Results Meeting - Sunday Morning 30th April

91 % of households completed questionnaires

92% of adult and 86% of young residents say they are satisfied overall living in Preston

We are worried about development, and changes forced on us

What shall we do about traffic and our environment?

“ I love the tranquility of the village, the beautiful walks and the people of Preston”

We want our parish to stay the same - to control any change for the better!



Come and hear what you have said, ask questions and discuss the implications.

Join us at **Princess Helena College**

analysis reports available from 10:30, **meeting starts 11:15**

The Steering Group will present an overview of the analysis results. A printed copy of the analysis report will be available for each household in the parish. The report will also be published online.

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Thank you for your help in completing the questionnaires. The quality and numbers of your responses will provide the support needed to write a robust neighbourhood plan that is more easily defended if challenged.

There is still a long way to go in both time and in effort. The next steps for developing the plan include:

- consulting other interested parties in our parish
- gathering information from various agencies
- discussing the survey results with you

With what we learn from these, we can draft objectives for a neighbourhood plan that represents our planning related interests as a community.

Do you run a business, charity, society or other organisation from or in the parish?

If you do, the steering group would like to talk to you. Your views from a business /non-residential perspective are important for us to consider as part of our neighbourhood planning. Please contact the steering group at sg@preston-np.org.uk or on 01462 434 403 to arrange a meeting so you can have your say.

You can find out more about the process of developing a plan via our website. For those of you who prefer more traditional communication give us a call and we can arrange to have a chat or supply printed materials.

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish – Our Future – Our Say

Survey Results Meeting

30 April 2017



Agenda

- Welcome
 - Apologies for absence
 - Facilities and Safety Notices
 - Thank You To...
 - Background
 - What is a Neighbourhood Plan
 - Our Journey So Far
 - Sample and Response Rates
 - Survey Results
 - Next Steps
 - Any Questions?
-

Thank You To...

- Princess Helena College for letting us host the meeting here
 - The Primary School and The Church Committee for agreeing to let us host future meetings there
 - The Insight Fountain and We Work With Data
 - Colin Kendall (Creamers Printers)
 - The Delivery / Collection Team Members
 - Those who have volunteered other help – if we haven't been in touch yet we will shortly
 - **Everyone who took part in the survey!**
-

Background: What is a Neighbourhood Plan

- Once made, a Neighbourhood Plan has statutory effect which the local authority must follow when determining planning policy and planning applications.
- It should have a vision and priorities up until 2031.
- These are some of the possible issues:
 - Housing: number, design, mix, location
 - Transport and rural roads – including traffic calming, footpaths, bridleways and access for visitors
 - Support for local businesses: development, connectivity, sustainability, building use
 - Community facilities for all age groups in the Parish, including green spaces and play areas
 - Long term growth in the village



Background: Our Journey So Far

| | |
|------------------|---|
| June 14 | Designated Area approved |
| June 26 | Village Meeting decision to produce a Neighbourhood Plan |
| July 14 | Steering Group Inaugural Meeting |
| November 5 | Drop in session – draft of Adult Questionnaire piloted |
| November 6 | The Insight Fountain engaged |
| December | Young Residents Questionnaire piloted |
| December | Questionnaires designed and printing commissioned |
| January 12 to 15 | Main delivery phase of questionnaires |
| Jan 28 to Feb 10 | Collected completed questionnaires |
| February 13 | Analysis begun |
| March 6 | Initial analysis results review with The Insight Fountain |
| March 9 | Additional analysis of open questions |
| April | Report completed and printed |

.....

The survey has been an opportunity none of us has ever had before.

We have reached this stage very quickly.

The survey has produced a body of evidence that will be of value to the whole Parish and its future endeavours.

Sample and Response Rate

Households

176 households in Preston

7 empty and 3 removed as out of scope

165 Households in study

plus Princess Helena College

8 declined / unable to take part

7 no answer

150 Households took part *plus PHC*

91% Household response rate

Individuals - Adults

336 adults aged 16+ in Preston

302 took part

90% Individual adult response rate

Individuals - Young Residents (Youth)

28 Young people aged 10-15

24 took part

86% Individual youth response rate

Plus Princess Helena College approx 30 young residents aged 11-15 of whom 7 took part

This is an excellent response rate and exceeds most Neighbourhood Plans.

We can be confident that the data is robust and is based on a sample that is representative of the population of Preston in 2017 giving reliable and valid results.

.....

Whilst we were still doing the fieldwork (collecting questionnaires and delivering some late copies) our Market Researchers told us that we were getting an extraordinarily good response rate. Of the households who took questionnaires to complete about 98% returned an envelope – we were told “THIS IS ALMOST UNHEARD OF IN MODERN MARKET RESEARCH”.





Well the great news is that there is a very high satisfaction rate with living in Preston.

You will see that 92% of adults are satisfied or very satisfied with living in Preston. Interestingly, those with children are notably more likely than those without to be very satisfied.

91% of adults and 69% of young people say it is very or quite important for Preston to have a Neighbourhood Plan.

We also asked what people liked most about living in Preston and 81% said green spaces and 60% said the community. Then we have the wonderful writing and pictures from the Under 10s. We asked them to say what they liked about living in Preston – and their work seems to sum up that it is the rural setting and things you can enjoy in it that we all say we like.

It will probably not be a surprise to anyone, that the biggest concern is traffic, transport and travel. Noise from Luton Airport, a poor bus service and badly maintained roads are concerns for residents of all ages.

As well as safety on the roads and transport, it is the lack of activities that our young people highlighted.

People are concerned about speeding traffic especially on certain roads and heavy traffic at certain times of the day.

A third of respondents said they would like a shop, and improving public transport and a reduction in traffic were the next most requested items.

Looking at what we have said we want to improve can add clarity and will help shape the objectives for our plan.



2. Amenities and Facilities

You've provided a lot of quality information about what is important, use and improvements you would like, if the money (time and people) became available. From a neighbourhood planning perspective we can develop policies that:

1. **Protect** the things which are important to us. Looking at usage and importance together, we can see that it is important to maintain each of these things even to those who seldom use them.

For example: typical usage of green spaces, footpaths and the Red Lion ranges from three times a month to once a year - yet 80% of us think it very important these are maintained.

The questions for the Young Residents are different in this section but the results indicate that the green spaces and facilities are important from the activities they support.

This gives strength to policies that protect assets, even in the face of criticism of low usage. The statistics are also supported by the comments you gave in the open questions.

2. **Facilitate enhancements** to and creation of new amenities and facilities. A neighbourhood plan can set policies to support these enhancements, but it is outside the remit and capability of a Neighbourhood Plan to provide or make them happen.

A note about interpreting the frequency of use collected in question A1. The results have not been normalised to reflect how many can use each of the things. The bus to secondary school is an example - low usage does not indicate lack of importance, all those who need it may be using it.

In some cases the usage can show things are well used when it might seem not. You can go for a walk on the footpaths and hardly meet another person - so it is great to see that so many of us regularly use the paths.

Participation in leisure activities and the requests for more to do are interesting from a planning perspective only in as much as shaping policies for the places and assets used (now and future).

That an activity is fairly niche is not negative - being able to see (and demonstrate) the diversity of activities may be significant in shaping (and defending) our policies.

Outside of planning the questions and your answers to this (and the previous) section have great value. For example:

- Annual events are clearly well supported – the results are a "thank you" to the organisers.
- If you want to organise extra activities, the survey results are a great place to see if there are other like minded residents in the parish you could collaborate with. Don't forget our Young Residents have also provided a comprehensive list.
- Some residents commented they didn't know there was so much available until the survey - a useful side effect. The News Letter, Preston News Service and Parish Council mail shots are all available (as appropriate) communication channels to promote and discover what's on, issues and opportunities.





3. Housing and Development

A lot of information was provided on current housing situations and views for development.

The main points from the questionnaires are that overall the preference is for:

- Small developments
- Two & three bedroom houses with gardens, off road parking, bicycle and scooter storage and low carbon footprint running
- Houses for families, local people, first time buyers and retirement dwellings.

The Steering Group will endeavour to include these points in the Neighbourhood Plan. We need to remember that the Neighbourhood Plan has to reflect the policies of the North Herts Local Plan.

A Neighbourhood Plan enhances our control of planning and does not remove any of our existing rights. We still have the usual mechanisms to support or object to any development.

Once the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan are in place, they have a life span of 15 years until 2031.

Any developers wishing to build in Preston have to adhere to both plans and go through the usual planning application procedure with North Herts District Council. It is at this point that local residents can make their views known.

If planning permission is granted and the development goes ahead, it is managed by the contractor. As with all new build, the NHDC building inspector will visit at strategic points and all building regulations must be followed.

The Parish Council and the Steering Group have no part to play in the construction process.





Not surprisingly it is very important for residents to protect the green spaces and views that they have. The rural setting is why many people choose to live in the Parish. Walking in the countryside is a very popular activity.

98% of people agree that it is important to have green space such as woodlands and fields between Preston and neighbouring villages and towns.

95% agree it is important to minimise the impact of development on woodland, hedges, footpaths, bridleways, green lanes, ponds, streams, verges and geological features.

93% agree that it is very important or quite important to minimise the impact of development on historic buildings and the Conservation Area.

Environmental issues in the Parish include 58% of respondents who are concerned about dog fouling and 52% about litter.

By far the most concern is about fly tipping, with 86% saying they are very concerned or quite concerned about this.

Whilst we can't use the Neighbourhood Plan to protect the views in and around the Parish on average people identified 7 views. The impact on Wain Wood, which is a site of special scientific interest, is a consideration for the District Council when a planning application is determined.



5. Transport and Communication

54% of replies would like 20mph speed limits in selected locations.

This is something the Parish Council are going to look at when they have the evidence from this report. Reducing speed limits is a very involved process and could take up to 5 years.

The Speed Indicator Device coming into Preston from Luton has been successful. The Parish Council have decided to ask for another one to be installed on entry to the village from Hitchin.

The Steering Group has noted that overall people feel **a good mobile phone signal is more important than having a landline.**

Planning permission has been granted for a phone mast at Preston Reservoir.

The Parish Council have recently been in contact with Waldon Telecom who put in the application about when they were likely to start and were informed that:

- At this stage they do not have a forecast date of when the site will be built, they are at least 3 months away, possibly longer.

As with all planning applications, they have 3 years in which to complete the work.

The improved broadband has clearly been a game changer for those who have a good service.

However, the survey shows that it is not the universal success we had hoped. There are a variety of reasons for why this is not the case so issues have to be addressed on an individual basis.

6. About You

(based on individuals)

7. Household Questions

(based on households not individuals)



A key issue in getting a Neighbourhood Plan made (into planning law) is showing that everyone [in the designated area] has had the opportunity to have their say and that those who have spoken are a representative sample. For this survey this is supported by the high response rate and that:

- The demographic data for individuals and households from the survey matches the composition of the population from the 2011 Census - so in that respect we are representative.
- The Collection records show that every geographic area in the parish has been sufficiently represented. There is no cluster of households which have not taken part.



8. Other Comments

All the comments, of which there were many, have been noted. The Steering Group and the Parish Council will be looking at them at future meetings and addressing issues, as appropriate, in the short, medium and long term and within their remit.



Next Steps

Short Term

- **Stage 2**
 - Deeper analysis of results
 - Gather other information
 - Define the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan
 - Engage volunteers for specific projects
 - Draft Plan based on objectives
 - Review and refine objectives and draft plan
 - Informal consultation

Until our Plan is “Made”

- **Stage 3** – Conduct formal round of public consultation
- **Stage 4** – Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan by an independent examiner - to ensure it meets all statutory obligations.
- **Stage 5** – Referendum conducted and paid for by NHDC – assuming the examiner recommends that our draft plan can proceed.

.....

We've made a great start but there's a long way to go.

We need to get deeper into analysing the results and begin to gather other information.

The Neighbourhood Plan will set out the community's overall vision for the Parish and should include overall aims for any future development. These can relate to a wide range of planning and regeneration matters – social, economic and environmental. The vision and aims of the plan can then be translated into detailed policies, guidance and proposals.

We will need an overview of the Parish which will provide a useful context for the policies including key evidence – social, economic and environmental data.

As you have heard, we need to include Planning policies as once made the Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the statutory local development plan and can contain policies against which development proposals will be considered.

We need to establish key themes and issues and help from volunteers will be very important to moving the plan forward, possibly with working groups tasked with exploring a particular issue or idea in more depth.

Once the draft plan has been produced we will need to conduct an informal consultation and then review the plan.

Stage 3 will be to conduct a formal round of public consultation followed by an examination of the Plan by an independent examiner.

Once the plan has been recommended to proceed, a referendum is held, paid for by NHDC. The Neighbourhood Plan needs a simple majority of more than 50% of people voting in favour to be adopted.



Any Questions?

Here is the set of questions from the attendees with the presenters' answers:

- Q *Having done this process, are there any questions you wish you'd asked?*
- A Perhaps on the school question, we could have phrased it slightly differently.
- We might have clarified the difference between dog walking v. ordinary walking.
- The process is not closed, tell us if we have missed anything.
- Q *Regarding broadband speeds, as I am completely non-technical I couldn't find the answer to this?*
- A Only about 64% people managed to answer this one, but gave a fairly consistent answer. Yes it was technical but the data we got was good, it enables us to work with BT going forward. Problems with the copper line to the village are being progressed with BT.
- Q *How much has all this cost?*
- A We have spent just under £7000 so far. We had a Government grant for £5088 and can apply for another £3912 to be spent by the end of the year. We have recently received a grant of £400 from NHDC to be spent on publicity materials. The flier advertising this meeting was paid for from that grant. The remainder has been paid by the Parish Council.
- Q *What has happened to the promised mobile phone mast?*
- A Planning permission was granted last October, valid for 3 years. The Preston Parish Council (PPC) has enquired when they intend to start work and have been told that at this stage they do not have a forecast date of when the site will be built, they are at least 3 months away, possibly longer.
- Q *With reference to the question on reducing speed limits, why does it take so long?*
- A Because we have to go through Herts County Council and the Police. PPC are doing all they can to progress through. We now have strong data from the questionnaire to back up our request for speed reductions.
- Q *Can we use some of the data in the meantime to help the parish? Eg speeds near the school.*
- A PPC can consult the school regarding speed limits around the school. Anything the PPC can use the data for, we will.
- Q *The questions on dog fouling, fly tipping, crime etc. I wasn't concerned at the time of the questionnaire but I am now, given that some crimes have occurred. What happens now?*
- A We can incorporate views at any time until the document [Neighbourhood Plan] is ready.



Q *Regarding development, what can we do in respect of the proposed 21 houses at Castlefield, to slow it down or control it?*

A The NHDC has allocated a maximum of 21 houses to Preston Village as a whole, this does not mean all 21 have to be built.

The Neighbourhood Plan has to mirror what has been put in the Local Plan, which has been agreed by Councillors. This Autumn an Inspector will examine the proposed Local Plan.

There is nothing we can do at present until a developer puts in a proposal. However as individuals we can all put forward our views at that point.

The Neighbourhood Plan will help control the development as it gives us important evidence about what should and shouldn't happen.

Q *Regarding the Local Plan, Preston has been designated as a Category A village – why? Did we fight that?*

A Yes, PPC tried hard to fight it over several years but was unable to succeed.

Q *If before the development proposed at Castlefield there's infill, does this reduce the total?*

A A. Yes it does, they will be deducted from the 21 allocated to the village. Infill is preferred by village residents. This squeezes out development opportunity.

Q *The main footpath in the village from Butchers Lane to Chequers Lane was missed off the questionnaire. Why?*

A At first it was an oversight, accidentally missed off, but once realised its inclusion would have affected print layout of the questionnaire making it more expensive to print.

Q *Why was Hitchwood footpath included if it's outside the parish?*

A It was felt necessary to include this as it is well used by residents and considered a village resource.



Here is your household's copy of the


Survey Result Report

Please let us have your e-mail address so we can send you you a copy of the questions and answers from the meeting and keep you updated.
Or let us know if you need a paper copy.

e-mail: sg@preston-np.org.uk
call: 01462 434 403



Your Vision and Objectives for the Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan



You Are Invited to a “Drop In Session”

in the
Village Hall

on
Thursday 5th October ~ 5.00 pm – 8.00pm

and
Saturday 7th October ~ 10.00am – 12.00 noon

Please join members of the Steering Group for an update on either or both of these days. You will be able to view the progress so far and add your opinions and comments on any aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan

Appendix 13

Extract from Preston Parish Newsletter; October 2017

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE

The Steering Group have arranged two drop-in sessions to update local residents on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan. These are being held on Thursday 5 October from 5p.m to 8p.m and on Saturday 7 October from 10 a.m to 12 noon. Both sessions are being held in the Village Hall. Please come along to view and comment on the proposed vision and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan. The Steering Group will look forward to seeing you there.

Appendix 14

Vision and Objectives ~ 5 October 2017 – Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

www.preston-np.org.uk/your-say/vision-and-objectives-5-october-2017

Home Our Parish Our Future Your Say More...

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Vision and Objectives ~ 5 October 2017

Dear Resident,

Please use this form to read and comment on the first draft of the Vision and Objectives for our Neighbourhood Plan. To demonstrate that genuine residents and stakeholders had participated, everyone attending a "Drop in Session" at the Village Hall was asked to sign in. For the same reason there is a similar request on this form.

When you have finished reviewing and commenting, please click the "Done" button at the bottom of the form to send us your feedback.

Many Thanks,
Alexandra, Di, Fay, Liz, Malcolm, Margaret, Rae and Wal

Please Sign In to this online "Drop in Session"

Your Name *

e-mail

This is optional, if you give us your e-mail the Parish Council will ensure you are on their mailing list and the Steering Group will send you confirmation that we have received your feedback.

The Vision for Preston Parish to 2031

Preston Parish thrives socially, economically and environmentally as a safe, tranquil, rural community where any development should be sustainable and of good, intelligent design to enhance its distinctive character. The heritage, biodiversity and position in the landscape should be respected and enhanced.

We will do this by:

- Encouraging a thriving and prosperous
- Promoting a distinctive and flourishing
- Supporting measured, proportionate, timely and sustainable development to meet the requirements of both the village and the Parish.
- Endorsing policies that have a positive effect on the environment, including those that mitigate climate change and reduce our carbon footprint.
- Maintaining the high quality natural environment with its protected wildlife interests.

Any comments? (optional)

Objectives

Living in Preston (Quality of Life)

Objective QL1 To encourage the provision of opportunities for social interaction through cultural, leisure, sport and commercial activities for all members of the community.

Agree Disagree Neither

Objective QL2 To promote a thriving and prosperous community that delivers a high quality of life for all its residents.

Agree Disagree Neither

Objective QL3 To strengthen the local economy that exhibits vitality and dynamism.

Agree Disagree Neither

Objective QL4 To sustain and enhance the high quality natural environment with its protected wildlife interests.

Agree Disagree Neither

Online Consultation

The format of the Drop In Session comment posters was replicated in an online form on the Neighbourhood Plan web site. See screenshot left.

The website is built using Wordpress and the form was set up and maintained using the Caldera Forms plugin. See screenshot below.

Appendix 15

Sample letter to landowners about Drop in sessions on objectives

Wednesday 6 September 2017

Dear

Preston Neighbourhood Plan

I am writing on behalf of the Steering Group to let you, as a landowner in the Parish, know that we are in the process of producing a Neighbourhood Plan for Preston.

At a village meeting in June 2016, with significant support from residents, a decision was taken to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish. The Parish Council delegated responsibility for this to a Steering Group.

In January 2017, questionnaires were delivered to every household in the Parish. These were collected in February and the data was analysed and collated by professional organisations. The resulting report was distributed to all households in April following a village meeting to explain and discuss it. A copy of the report are enclosed which I hope you will find interesting.

The Steering Group are now working on the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. The next step is to share the vision and objectives with local residents at two drop in sessions. These are being held in Preston Village Hall from 5 – 8 pm on Thursday 5 October 2017 and from 10 am to 12 noon on Saturday 7 October 2017. We would like to invite you and your representatives to attend one of these sessions. Members of the Steering Group will be present to discuss the Neighbourhood Plan and its progress so far.

In the meantime, if you have any queries about Preston Neighbourhood Plan and its production, please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Margaret Trinder
Parish Council Representative
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Appendix 16

Preston Neighbourhood Plan

Objectives: Agreement and comments by Local Residents following online consultation and two drop in sessions October 2017

Living in Preston (Quality of Life)

QL1: To encourage the provision of opportunities for social interaction through cultural, leisure, sport and commercial activities for all members of the community.

31 in favour, 0 against

QL2: To promote a community quality of life including clean air and water, enjoyment of unfettered open spaces, conservation of wildlife and natural resources, security from crime and protection from toxic substances.

25 in favour, 0 against

- This objective seems to cover a lot of issues. Might be better dividing it.
- What about aircraft noise and noise from the airport itself, especially at night? Light pollution from airport?"
- I agree with this (arrow to noise from the airport itself, especially at night)
- I agree re airport noise. And path they fly? Seems to be wide path moving closer to Preston
- I wonder about dog walking/paths etc.
- Controlling dogs is important for conserving wildlife-so perhaps rephrase the word unfettered
- Unfettered open spaces' what does it mean? Hope it is not a licence to trespass! – 1 in agreement

QL3: To strengthen and support economic activity.

24 in favour 0 against

- Needs qualification (on a scale compatible with Preston's character) – 2 in agreement
- Utilise/make most of the high cyclist traffic-currently don't really serve them or benefit from them economically
- How could this be achieved?

Note: This comment was written under comment 2 but it is not clear whether it pertains to the comment or the Objective.

QL4: To sustain and improve excellent local facilities for existing and new residents.

28 in favour, 0 against

- Why only 'excellent' local facilities?
- To sustain excellent local facilities and improve ones that aren't excellent(!)
- Including not only the Red Lion, St Martin's church and Preston Primary School, but also when appropriate and possible a village shop.

QL5: To prioritise local distinctiveness in every element of change and growth.

26 in favour, 0 against

- add 'where appropriate' – 2 in agreement

Amenities and Facilities

AF1: To support all existing amenities, facilities and services available in the parish and all new ventures where possible for the benefit of the community.

28 in favour, 0 against

- Remove 2nd 'all' change to 'where appropriate (not possible)' – an extra tick if changes made. Amended comment received 2 ticks of agreement
- See QL4 above

AF 2: To support existing businesses and promote businesses and employment opportunities on a scale compatible with Preston Parish's rural character.

29 in favour, 0 against

Housing and Development

HD1: To ensure that any development is sensitively planned and phased over the period of the Plan, protecting and enriching the landscape and built setting.

26 in favour, 0 against

- Do not think any planning aspect should be above and beyond rest of North Herts
- Not to just accept that we will have the number of houses as defined by the NHDC Plan (41?) but to resist and reduce number where possible
- Any development should respect the need for rights of way that link different areas within the village. New pathways that encourage these links should integrate with existing rights of way.

HD2: To ensure that any development delivers a range of housing to meet local needs.

28 in favour, 0 against, 1 neither

- Would be good to have some specific support/ consideration for some (limited) additional affordable housing (but on a different basis to previous and ensure it's truly affordable)
- For affordable houses they should be 1 and 2 bedrooms and NOT 3 bedrooms.
- Be specific about the size of affordable houses eg 1 and 2 bedrooms.
1 agreement with comments
- Establishing local 'needs' is a doubtful exercise. Such surveys in the past have merely introduced nebulous 'wish lists' without a sound basis that has any bearing on an established 'need'. Demand is far better assessed by assessing either economic market conditions, or clearly established hardship.

HD3: To support developments which are of a high quality design with a low carbon footprint, eco-friendly and of a scale that reinforces local character.

23 in favour, 0 against

- Add “where appropriate”
- Provided they remain affordable where appropriate
- 'High quality design' can be clearly illustrated. I commend to the group to obtain and see the Supplementary Planning Guidance Vols. 13 'Historic buildings; Repairs, Alterations & extensions and SPG Vol 7: The Location and Design of Small Residential Developments published in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan.

Most of the principles described in these documents relate to the character of this area, and while there are distinctions - these could easily be introduced in a similar format to suit our circumstances. I hold a copy of both these documents if you wish to examine them.

- Older residents may wish to downsize and there are very few smaller properties available.

HD4: To support the provision of solar panels, electric car charging points and bicycle and mobility scooter stores for all new homes.

16 in favour, 10 against, 1 neither

- At present solar panels on roofs detract entirely with the image of the rural village we aim to retain.
- We should encourage where appropriate but not support
- Encourage where appropriate and where they don't detract from the rural nature of village.
- DEF electric car charging points
- Electric charging points not necessary
- I do not favour roof level solar panels - nor solar parks created on farmland. This technology is only supported by artificial tax benefits, and they do not contribute to the character of the rural built environment and landscape. Not all homes need mobility scooters - but proper provision for access for the disabled should be considered essential.
- I think solar panels are unsightly and of limited household savings. Building eco/thermally efficient housing is in my opinion the way forward. Electric car charging points, the technology still in infancy. Definitely agree that stores for bicycles & mobility scooters are a good thing

HD5: To support developments which enable residents to work from home.

23 in favour, 0 against, 1 neither

- Depends what kind of work – 2 in agreement
- What does this mean?
- Eg high speed broad band and mobile phone signal
- Why is this a neighbourhood/local planning issue? I do feel improved access to better communications is vital for all communities - but this should be a matter of basic infrastructure planning to be part of the Local Plan itself.
- We already have fibre optic broadband to most of the village, what other developments do you propose?

HD6: To ensure that any development includes provision for off road parking for a minimum of 2 cars and each property should have the benefit of a garden.

26 in favour, 1 against

HD7: To deliver a housing growth strategy tailored to the needs and context of Preston.

29 in favour, 0 against

- Preston has seen a lot of growth over the decades, as much through on-off houses. The larger developments have worked less well. Not sure how a strategy can be tailored to influence / control this.

HD8: To ensure that any new development does not create problems with sewage, surface water drainage or water pressure, nor does it have a negative impact on the infrastructure, services and utilities of existing houses, while at the same time ensuring that any existing problems are not exacerbated.

28 in favour, 0 against

- Add “amenities” after services and utilities
- AND ROADS 1 agreement with comments
- Also to ensure that adequate provision for water supply, power, & telecommunications can be provided without disruption to existing services.

HD9: To ensure that individual extensions do not lead to over-development of any site, nor to any reduction in village amenities.

24 in favour, 1 against

- It is essential that extensions do not lead to 'cramming' within the built environment that detract from the character of the locality.
- This has already happened. Especially the new extension width wise in Butchers lane

HD10: To ensure any infill development is sustainable and does not detract from the character of the village.

31 in favour, 0 against

- ...and the limitations in
- and includes the limitations set out in HD9
- See my notes earlier - re: Objective HD3

HD11: To ensure that all development meets the requirements of the relevant Housing and Development Policies contained within this Plan in order to reduce the impact of building construction for local residents, surrounding properties and the narrow lanes within the village.

27 in favour, 0 against

Environment and Heritage

EH1: To protect and enhance the unique rural environment of the parish, and its varied landscapes.

27 in favour 0 against

- Why only the unique rural environment?
- Yes why only the 'unique'?
- We need a better appreciation of the natural landscape with the village environs. It was undertaken about 35 years ago - with considerable consideration of trees, tree belts, hedgerows, enclosures including fencing etc., the character of open spaces, skylines, wind belts etc.. I feel this should form part of our assessment in completing the Neighbourhood Plan.

EH2: To support wildlife conservation, and to maintain and enhance the different habitats and their distinctive species.

26 in support 1 in support of comment 0 against

- To support the conservation of flora and fauna and to enhance the distinctive and varied species
- Hopefully we won't be invaded by boars - as in the Forest of Dean - but we do have problems with fallow deer and muntjacs that cause a considerable nuisance.

EH3: To maintain and protect good access to the countryside by means of footpaths and bridleways, and by safety on the lanes.

26 in support 0 against

- Omit "safely on the lanes" as this could mean safety measures incompatible with rural lanes.

EH4: To protect 'greenspace' e.g The Green and all verges, within and around the village, so as to maintain and enhance the open and spacious appearance of this rural settlement.

26 in support 2 against

- Omit "open and spacious"
- Verges do suffer with the number of large vehicles using the lanes

EH5: To recognize the visual merits of the built environment across the parish, and to seek to protect this architectural heritage, especially that of the many Listed Buildings.

24 in support 0 against, 1 neither

- Recognise **all** merits not just the visual ones. 5 people in support of the amendment
- In principal I agree partly, but we should not lose sight of the fact that there is technology available nowadays that allow for sensible modernisation of listed buildings without losing the aesthetic, i.e. modern double glazing etc. Also having an ultra-modern addition to a listed building can enhance said building. Unfortunately the 'Heritage' department of planning often fail to recognise that fact and seem to have a very negative view. After all these are often peoples' homes and not museums.

EH6: To take special care of the Conservation Area, and to raise awareness of the legislation relevant to it.

29 in support 0 against

- Rephrase: "awareness of the relevant legislation"

EH7: To ensure new developments do not create flood risk and problems with the sewerage system and surface water drainage, while at the same time ensuring that any existing problems are not exacerbated.

27 in support 0 against

- 6 extra dwellings have already created sewage problems in the village.
- "or change existing roads and lanes"
- Is this the same as HD8?

Transport and Communication

TC 1: To support and encourage safe and sustainable transport, including walking, and cycling.

31 in favour 0 against

- Consider introducing a communal taxi type service – domestic uber? Could link in with St Pauls Walden.

TC2: To support and encourage safe use of roads, paths and bridleways for all users: walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders, as well as being safe for motorised vehicles.

27 in favour 0 against

- A 20 mph speed limit in the Village would be welcomed 3 agree to this comment
- 20 mph speed limited **not** necessary
- Please ensure they respect criteria of different routes – BOAT, Bridleway, Footpath, Cyclists and Riders in particular.
- Not too many signs plse. The number of signs cluttering up the built environment are an eyesore.

TC3: To support the development of efficient and effective broadband and mobile connectivity throughout the Parish, meeting the domestic, social and business needs of the community.

28 in favour 0 against

- While maintaining a good landline service

TC 4: To support the maintenance of the rural character of the lanes in the Parish.

29 in favour 0 against




- And preserve the natural hedges 1 in favour of this comment
- No street lamps

TC5: To support on-going improvements to transport, to utility infrastructure and to digital connectivity.

25 in favour 0 against

- Provided it does not conflict with TC4 2 in favour of this comment
- "Digital connectivity" is covered by TC3 so perhaps should be omitted here
- The key improvement we really need is for the roads to be maintained so that broken surfaces and potholes are swiftly repaired. These are now very dangerous when cyclists have to suddenly swerve and pedestrians are hindered so that vehicles face uncertain behaviour on our narrow lanes.

Appendix: 17
Vision and Objectives
Drop-In



Appendix 18

Preston Neighbourhood Plan

Consultees for Regulation 14 Consultation

| Consultation Body Name | Consultation Body Type |
|---|--|
| Pilkington Farm Partnership | Landowner |
| St Paul's Walden Estate | Landowner |
| Princess Helena College | Landowner |
| Mr R Taylor | Landowner |
| Mr P Boyle | Landowner |
| Derek Prince Ministries | Landowner |
| Preston Nursery School | A school in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Preston Primary School | A school in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Princess Helena College | A school in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Redmayne Bentley | Local business, not resident or landowner |
| Preston Trust | Village organisation, a registered charity with the remit of preserving the history and character of Preston |
| Langley Parish Meeting | Adjoining Parish |
| Offley Parish Council | Adjoining Parish |
| St Ippolyts Parish Council | Adjoining Parish |
| St Paul's Walden Parish Council | Adjoining Parish |
| Kings Walden Parish Council | Adjoining Parish |
| Bim Afolami | Local MP |
| David Barnard | District Councillor |
| Faye Frost | District Councillor |
| Clare Strong | District Councillor |
| Clare Skeels | Senior Planning Officer, NHDC |
| David Charlton | Senior Estates Manager, NHDC |
| Chairman of the Council | NHDC |
| Environment Agency | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(f) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 |
| Historic England | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(g) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 |
| Natural England | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(e) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 |
| Homes and Communities Agency | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(d) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 |
| Hertfordshire Community NHS Trust | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(l)(i) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 |
| The Highways Agency | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(i) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 |
| Chief Executive and Director of Environment, Herts County Council | Consultation Body under Schedule 1, para 1(l)(i) the Neighbourhood Planning (General) |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Regulations 2012 |
| Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre | Environmental Information Management |
| Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust | Wildlife Charity |
| CPRE Hertfordshire | Charity Protecting the Countryside |
| Chief Fire Officer (Herts CC) | Fire and Rescue Service |
| PC Matt Jenkins | Preston's Police officer |
| PCSO Heather Burrows | Preston's PCSO |
| Hertfordshire Highways | Service Provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Thames Water | Service Provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Affinity Water | Service Provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Anglian Water | Service Provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| UK Power Networks | Service Provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Open Reach (BT) | Service Provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Waldon Telecom | Planned service provider in our Neighbourhood Area |
| Vodafone | Planned user of phone mast, when installed |

Appendix 19

PRESTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Friday 5 January 2018

Dear

Preston Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation

I am writing to you, as landowner/ NHDC representative/ business/ statutory body/, to inform you that the Regulation 14 Consultation on Preston's Draft Neighbourhood Plan will be open from Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February 2018.

The purpose of this consultation is to seek representations from statutory consultees and others whose interests may be affected by the draft proposals made.

This is an online consultation and will be accessible via the Neighbourhood Plan website: **www.preston-np.org.uk**, and by following the link to **Your Say**. Other documents that are referenced within the plan are also held on the web site for you to view.

To support this process the Steering Group are holding meetings in the village hall on the following dates where both online and hard copies of the draft Plan will be available to view:

- Thursday 11 January: 6.30 – 8.30 p.m
- Saturday 13 January: 10.00 - 12.00
- Thursday 8 February: 6.30 – 8.30 p.m
- Saturday 10 February: 10.00 - 12.00

If you have any questions about the consultation please come along on one of these dates and the Steering Group will be very pleased to offer their assistance. Alternatively, you are welcome to contact the Steering Group: tel: 01462 434403 at any time during the consultation period.

All responses to this consultation will be taken into account and the draft plan amended where appropriate.

We will look forward to receiving your response to our Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely

M Trinder

Margaret Trinder
Parish Council Representative
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Appendix 20 - January Newsletter and Website for Regulation 14

The newsletter entry for January 2018 and web pages publicising the Regulation 14 Consultation were prepared during, and published at the end of, December 2017.

January Newsletter Entry

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

The next stage in the Neighbourhood Plan process is the Regulation 14 consultation which will take place from Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February. This is an online consultation and will be accessible via the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk, then follow the link to Your Say.

To support this process the Steering Group are holding consultations in the village hall on the following dates:

- Thursday 11 January: 6.30 – 8.30p.m
- Saturday 13 January: 10.00 - 12.00
- Thursday 8 February: 6.30 – 8.30 p.m
- Saturday 10 February: 10.00 - 12.00

If you have any questions about the consultation or you do not have access to online facilities, please come along on one of these dates and the Steering Group will be very pleased to offer their assistance.

A paper copy of the draft plan will be available on loan for anyone without online facilities and who cannot attend on one of the above dates. Please phone: 434403 to organise this. A paper copy will also be available in the Red Lion.

Anyone who has any queries about the draft plan at any time during the consultation period is welcome to contact the Steering Group: tel: 434403..

Neighbourhood Plan Website - Home Page Published 29 December 2017

The website is built using a responsive design - that is it automatically adjusts page layout to suit traditional PC's (see below), smaller screens, tablets, smart phones and internet devices (see thumbnail screenshot on right).



[Home](#) [Our Parish](#) [Our Future](#) [Your Say](#) [More...](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14)

The **draft Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan** is now available for informal consultation under Regulation 14. This gives all of us (residents, businesses and other stakeholders) the opportunity to raise questions, make comments and express our support for the draft plan before the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

You can take part from...

Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February

...via this link to **Your Say**.

To support this process the Steering Group are holding sessions, to answer any questions you may have about the consultation and for those who do not have internet access, in

The Village Hall

| | |
|----------------------|------------------|
| Thursday 11 January | 6:30 – 8:30 pm |
| Saturday 13 January | 10:00 – 12:00 am |
| Thursday 8 February | 6:30 – 8:30 pm |
| Saturday 10 February | 10:00 – 12:00 am |



Paper copies of the plan will also be available to borrow for those who do not have internet access. For help or to borrow a copy please call the Steering Group via the telephone number published on the posters, in the newsletter and via e-mails – or use the [contact form](#).

Progress and Next Steps

The Neighbourhood Plan will describe our shared vision of what is important to us and how we want the Parish to develop over the next 14 years. The

Appendix 21 - Regulation 14 Publicity Media

To maintain / improve awareness the Steering Group ran a publicity campaign of occasional e-mail messages, newsletter entries, changing web content and additional/changing posters.

February Newsletter Entry

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

The Steering Group would like to thank everyone who has already responded to the Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation which is open until Sunday 18 February and is accessible via the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk, then follow the link to Your Say.

To support this process the Steering Group are holding consultations in the village hall on the following dates:

- Thursday 8 February: 6.30 – 8.30 p.m
- Saturday 10 February: 10.00 - 12.00

If you have any questions or do not have online facilities please come along on one of these dates or telephone 01462 434403 and the Steering group will be happy to help you.

Posters

A4 Posters (shown on the right) were put up on village notice boards, in The Red Lion public house and copies given to the schools for their notice boards.

A few days before the consultation was opened sign boards were put up at key locations in and around the village, where most parishioners would see them.

These featured A3 size posters, shown on the next page. Two of the posters were put up adjacent to the entrances to The Red Lion public house telling visitors that a printed copy was available to view inside during opening hours.

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

The draft Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan is ready for informal consultation under Regulation 14.

This gives all of us (residents, businesses and other stakeholders) the opportunity to raise questions, make comments and express our support for the draft plan before the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

You can take part from...

Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February

...via the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk


To support this process the Steering Group are holding sessions, to answer any questions you may have about the consultation and for those who do not have internet access, in


| The Village Hall | |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Thursday | 11 January 6:30 - 8:30 pm |
| Saturday | 13 January 10:00 - 12:00 am |
| Thursday | 8 February 6:30 - 8:30 pm |
| Saturday | 10 February 10:00 - 12:00 am |

Paper copies of the plan will also be available to borrow for those who do not have internet access. For help or to borrow a copy please call the Steering Group on 01462 434 403 or use the contact form on the website.


Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Map © Crown copyright and database rights 2017 OS 6100058314 Annotation © Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 2018





After four weeks of the consultation the general A3 posters, shown above, were replaced with A2 size posters shown below.



E-mails

E-mails were sent publicising Regulation 14 prior to and during the consultation. Both the Parish Council mailing list and the Preston News service were used for e-mails. Some were simple text and others a richer format. A sample of three is shown below.

Subject: PNS - NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION
From:
Date: 05/01/18 17:14
To:

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

Dear Resident

We, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, would like to tell you that the next stage in the Neighbourhood Plan process is the Regulation 14 consultation which will take place from Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February. This is an online consultation and will be accessible via the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk, and by following the link to Your Say, where there will be instructions on how to respond.

To support this process the Steering Group are holding meetings in the village hall on the following dates:

- Thursday 11 January: 6.30 – 8.30 pm
- Saturday 13 January: 10.00 - 12.00
- Thursday 8 February: 6.30 – 8.30 pm
- Saturday 10 February: 10.00- 12.00

If you have any questions about the consultation, please come along on one of these dates and the Steering Group will be very pleased to offer their assistance.

A hard copy of the draft plan will be available on loan for anyone without online facilities and who cannot attend on one of the above dates. If you know anyone in this situation, please tell them to phone: 01462 434403 to organise this. A hard copy will also be available in the Red Lion.

Anyone who has any queries about the draft plan at any time during the consultation period is welcome to contact the Steering Group: tel: 01462 434403.

Kind Regards

The Steering Group

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

From: Preston Trust

Subject: PNS - The Draft Neighbourhood Plan - Your Next Steps

To: The Preston Trust

16/01/18 11:06

Reply Reply Followup Forward More

Having trouble viewing this email? [View it in your browser here](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish – Our Future – Our Say

2011 - 2031

Dear Resident

We would like to thank everyone who has already submitted their response to the Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation and to those who attended the meetings last Thursday evening and Saturday morning to ask questions. As a result of the feedback we have received, we would like to give you some further information about the consultation.

We were very grateful for the fantastic response to the questionnaires last January from which we were able to produce the survey results report. This was the first step and we now realise that some residents thought that this was all they had to do.

The Steering Group used the results of the survey to produce the draft Neighbourhood Plan.



The Regulation 14 Consultation, which is now open, is the next step for which we need your help. This is your opportunity to comment on the Plan and say whether you agree or disagree with it. Once we have received all of your comments, we can make any amendments to the Plan. This is our last chance to do this before it is sent to NHDC for the next stage of the process.

Please do not be put off by the number of pages; we hope that you will find some really interesting information in the Plan and particularly in the Appendix. Most importantly we would like you to consider the Policies as these will be particularly important for future planning applications for the Parish. If you disagree with anything it would be helpful if you could also say what you would replace it with.

It is possible to respond in stages. Our software doesn't allow you to save, then add more before submitting it but you can submit part of your response one day, then another part another day.

If you agree with the whole plan, it is important that you tell us, so we know it meets the aims and aspirations of local residents. There is an option on the last page to say you agree with everything that you have not commented on.

We are aware that we have asked you to complete a lengthy task but hope that you will do so for the long term benefit of the parish.

If you have any questions or queries or need help with completing the consultation, then please feel free to contact us by phoning 01462 434403 between 9 am and 8 pm or via the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk and we will do our best to help you.

Kind regards
The Steering Group

Please share this information with anyone you know who might not be on the e-mail list and is living in Preston.

Done.

From: Preston Trust
Subject: **PNS - Neighbourhood Plan Sessions this Week**
To: The Preston Trust
05/02/18 21:17

Having trouble viewing this email? [View it in your browser here](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish – Our Future – Our Say

2011 - 2031

Dear Resident

The Steering Group are holding consultations in the village hall on:

- Thursday 8 February: 6.30 – 8.30 pm
- Saturday 10 February: 10.00 - 12.00

to help residents respond to the consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, if they have not already done so.

If you have any questions about the process, the Steering Group will be very pleased to help, either at these meetings, by phone: 01462 434403 between 9 am and 8 pm or via the Neighbourhood Plan website: www.preston-np.org.uk



This is your opportunity to comment on the Plan and say whether you agree or disagree with it. Once we have received all of your comments, we can make any amendments to the Plan. This is our last chance to do this before it is sent to NHDC for the next stage of the process.

You can view or download a copy following this link ...

[Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan](#)

... and respond with any comments (or express your support) using the form by following this link:

['Regulation 14' Consultation form](#)

Feedback from some residents who have responded already is that it takes between 30 and 90 minutes to read and comment.

Please do not be put off by the number of pages; we hope that you will find some really interesting information in the Plan and particularly in the Appendix. Most importantly we would like you to consider the Policies as these will be particularly important for future planning applications for the Parish. If you disagree with anything it would be helpful if you could also say what you would replace it with.

It is possible to respond in stages. Our software doesn't allow you to save, then add more before submitting it but you can submit part of your response one day, then another part another day.

If you agree with the whole plan, it is important that you tell us, so we know it meets the aims and aspirations of local residents. There is an option on the last page to say you agree with everything that you have not commented on.

Please remember that the consultation closes at **midnight on Sunday 18 February**. Any replies received after this deadline cannot be considered.

We look forward to receiving your response.

Kind regards
The Steering Group

Please share this information with anyone you know who might not be on the e-mail list and is living in Preston.


Neighbourhood Plan Website - Home Page Content

The home page was updated to indicate which consultation session was next – see Appendix 20 for initial page content.

[Home](#) [Our Parish](#) [Our Future](#) [Your Say](#) [More...](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14)

The **draft Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan** is **now available** for informal consultation under Regulation 14. This gives all of us (residents, businesses and other stakeholders) the opportunity to raise questions, make comments and express our support for the draft plan before the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

You can take part from...

Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February


...via this link to **Your Say**.

To support this process the Steering Group are holding sessions, to answer any questions you may have about the consultation and for those who do not have internet access, in

The Village Hall

Thursday 11 January 6:30 – 8:30 pm
Saturday 13 January 10:00 – 12:00 am
Thursday 8 February 6:30 – 8:30 pm [← next session](#)
Saturday 10 February 10:00 – 12:00 am

There is a paper copy of the plan available to read, *during opening hours*, in the Red Lion.
Paper copies of the plan are also available to borrow for those who do not have internet access. For help or to borrow a copy please call the Steering Group via the telephone number published on the posters, in the newsletter and via e-mails – or use the [contact form](#).



The content was updated to reflect feedback from early respondents that in their opinion reading the plan and using the consultation form was neither a difficult nor lengthy chore. Once the last consultation session was finished the list of dates was removed. The final content of the home page with all of these changes is shown below.

[Home](#) [Our Parish](#) [Our Future](#) [Your Say](#) [More...](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14)

The **draft Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan is now available** for informal consultation under Regulation 14. The consultation runs from Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February. This gives all of us (residents, businesses and other stakeholders) the opportunity to raise questions, make comments and express our support for the draft plan before the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

You can take part ...
until midnight on Sunday 18 February
...via this link to **Your Say**.

Feedback from some residents who have already responded, is that it takes between 30 and 90 minutes to read and comment.

You can contact us for help up until 8pm Sunday evening — please use the [Contact the Steering Group](#) form or call our help line on 01462 434403 (daily 9am to 8pm).

There is a paper copy of the plan available to read, *during opening hours*, in the Red Lion.
Paper copies of the plan are also available to borrow for those who do not have internet access. To borrow a copy please contact the Steering Group as above.

Please note that replies received after the deadline cannot be considered.

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2021 - 2031

C.2 Built Environment


Local Buildings
This is a historical map, and applies to all buildings in the parish. It is not a map of the parish, but a map of the built environment. It shows the location of all buildings in the parish, and the date they were built. It is a map of the built environment, and not a map of the parish.



The map shows the location of all buildings in the parish, and the date they were built. It is a map of the built environment, and not a map of the parish.

Preston Hertfordshire Website

The newly redesigned Preston website went live at the start of February. This was publicised using the Preston News Service. From "go-live" until the end of the Regulation 14 Consultation this website featured a pop up message about Regulation 14 with links to the Neighbourhood Plan site.



Appendix 22 - Regulation 14 Consultation

Photographic record of Regulation 14 Consultation Sessions



Operation of the Regulation 14 Consultation

The consultation was hosted on the Neighbourhood Plan website and conducted online. Paper copies of the plan were available for residents to borrow. Verbal and written responses were also accepted, where possible these were entered on the form by a Steering Group member and an e-mail or print copy supplied to the respondent.

The Your Say page of the Neighbourhood Plan website provided links to: the Draft Plan, supporting documents and Regulation 14 Response Form. The supporting documents consisted of the Draft Consultation Statement, Basic Conditions Statement and SEA Screening Document.

[Home](#) [Our Parish](#) [Our Future](#) [Your Say](#) [More...](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Your Say

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14)

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say
2011 - 2031

Please take a few moments to view this presentation

You can pause the presentation by placing your pointer over the slides.
Clicking on the left or right sides of a slide, lets you step backwards and forwards.
You can also swipe on touch screens.

● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14)

Monday 8 January to Sunday 18 February

The draft Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan is now available for informal consultation under Regulation 14. This gives all of us (residents, businesses and other stakeholders) the opportunity to raise questions, make comments and express our support for the draft plan before the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

Please read through the draft copy of the plan. You can view or download a copy following this link ...

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan – draft version for the Regulation 14 Consultation

There is a paper copy of the plan available to read, *during opening hours*, in the Red Lion.
Paper copies of the plan will also be available to borrow for those who do not have internet access. For help or to borrow a copy please use the [Contact the Steering Group](#) form or call our help line on 01462 434403 (9am to 8pm)

... and respond with any comments (or express your support) using the form by following this link:

'Regulation 14' Consultation form

This is the last opportunity to have Your Say before the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

There are a number of additional documents that are part of the statutory Neighbourhood Plan process. You can find the full set of documents by following these links:

Draft Consultation Statement (Regulation 14) – January 2018




Basic Conditions Statement (Regulation 14) – January 2018


Preston Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening January 2018

If you need help with the consultation or have any questions about the Neighbourhood Plan please use the [Contact the Steering Group](#) form or call our help line on 01462 434403 (9am to 8pm).

Presentation slide show

The presentation shown on the above example was designed and added on Saturday 13 January to address feedback from residents who had been put off by the number of pages in the Draft Plan. It is a simple web slideshow, featuring 8 slides as shown below.





There is a separate form page for each section and appendix

You can use the **Next** and **Back** buttons to turn forward and back through the pages of the form

Back **Next**

8. Amenities and Facilities

Please include the related paragraph number(s) where relevant to a comment.

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.10

Any comments?

Please leave blank if you have no comments

POLICY AF1: New and Improved Community Facilities

Any comments?

Progress indicator: 10 dots, 1st dot highlighted.

There are comment boxes for groups of paragraphs, sections of text and objectives

Each policy has a separate comment box - shaded to match

Back **Next**

8. Amenities and Facilities

Please include the related paragraph number(s) where relevant to a comment.

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.10

Any comments?

Please leave blank if you have no comments

POLICY AF1: New and Improved Community Facilities

Any comments?

Progress indicator: 10 dots, 1st dot highlighted.

Please select one of the following options to summarise your response to the draft plan:

Overall Summary of Response *

- ☐ I am happy with the draft plan and have not felt the need to make any comments
- ☐ I am generally happy with the draft plan, but have made some comments and/or suggestions
- ☐ There are one or more aspects of the draft plan I object to - I have commented on my concerns and how they might be addressed

If you have any other comments, that will not sit in any of the earlier pages, please use the box below:

Any Other Comments

When you are ready to submit all of your responses, click the button below -

Submit my response

Progress indicator: 10 dots, 10th dot highlighted.

Even if, once you have read the plan, you don't feel any need to comment, please step through to the last page.

Select the option to summarise your response.

You can also leave any other comment as appropriate.

The Regulation 14 Consultation Form

The first "form page" contains a letter from the Steering Group Chairman

Introduction and Guidance Notes for The Online Consultation Comments Form

Introduction:

'Regulation 14' is the next stage of the process in creating our Neighbourhood Plan. This follows a review by an independent planning consultant and now gives all of us (residents, businesses and other stakeholders) the opportunity to raise questions, make comments and express support for the draft plan before the formal examination and consultation conducted by North Herts. District Council, (Regulation 16).

Guidance Notes:

In order for you to assist with this process, please review the Draft Plan document and note any comments you have on this comments form. Please try to be as succinct as possible. If you disagree with anything, we would be grateful if you could suggest an alternative. If you want to discuss any matter regarding the Draft Plan or Consultation Process with a member of the Steering Group please contact us using the Contact Page or call us on 01462 434403 (9am to 8pm).

The comments form requests certain personal details, so we can verify that comments are from eligible parties and act as moderator if needed. By responding to the survey you are asked to accept that your comments will form part of the public record, but we give you an undertaking that your identity will not be revealed as is required under the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.

The last page of this form has options for you to summarise your response. *If you are happy with the draft and do not want to make any comments* you can step through to the last page, select your summary response and click submit.

There is additional help and guidance for using this form at the bottom of the page.

On behalf of the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and our whole community, I thank you for your participation in the consultation process.

Wally Steele

Steering Group Chairman

There is a link to the plan followed by further Help and Guidance below every "form page".

Clicking on this link will ask your browser to open a copy of the plan document in a new tab or window –

[Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan – draft version for the Regulation 14 Consultation](#)

Help and Guidance

Can I have a copy of the plan open as well as this form?

Yes. There are many different ways that people like to work, so these are just some suggestions:

Most web browsers let you have different pages or documents open in separate windows or tabs. You can usually open a new tab or window from the menu or by using right or option click on the link and selecting something like "open in new window".

- The draft plan can be downloaded to your device (computer, tablet, phone) and then opened using a PDF viewer application.
- You can switch between tabs, windows or applications – often with a keyboard shortcut (note the keys may be different depending on whether you use Windows, Apple, Android or Linux).
- If you have a big screen you can even put the form and the plan next to each other in separate windows.
- Of course, you can always print off your own copy of the plan and make notes on it first.

How do I make the comment boxes bigger?

You can change the size of a comment box by dragging the bottom right hand corner.

(Dragging varies according to device: with a mouse you click and hold the button down on the corner and move the mouse; on some touch screens you hold your finger on the screen and then drag your finger to required position.)

Who is eligible to respond?

The "target group" of respondents is residents of the parish, businesses and organisations (including local government and statutory bodies) that have a stake in or responsibility for the parish. However, anyone who has a genuine stake or interest may respond – please make sure you say in what capacity you are responding.

The consultation is for individuals to respond. Not everyone in the same household may agree on everything. Different people in an organisation may have different perspectives depending on what they do.

The Steering Group has a responsibility to make sure that only responses from real people and organisations are included. Anonymous responses will not be accepted, nor will any comments containing inflammatory or offensive remarks.

I don't have any comments to make, why should I respond?

We would like to know if you agree and support the plan. There is an option on the last page to say you agree with everything that you have not commented on.

What if I want I'm not good with computers, can I have help?

Yes of course. If you have somebody you trust they can help you enter your response, or if you would prefer one of the Steering Group will help. We also have a small number of paper copies if you need to borrow one. See the letter on the first page of this form for contact details and dates for consultation sessions in the Village Hall.

to change what I have written after submitting my response?

The software we are using (Caldera Forms) collates responses and lets us sort and group by your personal details. You can submit another response with any additional or revised comments. We will be able to see from the time of your response which is the most recent and merge them together accordingly.

Can I save what I have written and come back later?

We are using the free version of Caldera Forms which does not allow for save and return. However, the same as if you wanted to change a response you can submit a partial response, start again from the next section and submit that.

Two examples of the data entry form pages are shown below. The user can step backward and forward through the form using the buttons at the top and bottom of the data entry area.

www.preston-np.org.uk/reg-14-consultation/

Home Our Parish Our Future Your Say More...

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan - 'Regulation 14' Consultation

Back Next

Please tell us about you:

Your Name *

Postcode

Please put your home postcode if responding as an individual

Please supply a contact e-mail address (preferred) and/or phone number. This allows us to give you confirmation that we can process your response. It is also in case we need to verify your eligibility to comment, clarify or moderate any comments before they become a matter of public record.

E-mail address

Phone Number

In what capacity are you responding? *

☐ A - I live in the Parish
☐ B - I work in the Parish
☐ C - I run a business in the Parish
☐ D - I am a landowner living in the Parish
☐ E - I am a landowner living elsewhere
☐ F - Other Capacity - please specify below

If you selected A - I live in the Parish, please indicate which questionnaire group you belong to ...

☐ Adult (now 17 years and older)
☐ Young Resident (now 11 to 16 years)
☐ Under 10 (now 10 years or younger)

Please select all that apply

If you selected F - Other Capacity, please specify below ...

For example, specify the name of the organisation you represent and your job title or role

By supplying these details you accept that your comments will form part of the public record, but that we give you an undertaking that your identity will not be revealed as required under the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.

Back Next

www.preston-np.org.uk/reg-14-consultation/

Home Our Parish Our Future Your Say More...

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan - 'Regulation 14' Consultation

Back Next

8. Amenities and Facilities

This section starts on page 25

To help collate your responses there are separate comment boxes for different sub-sections and for each policy. Please use the comment box associated with that sub-section or policy if you wish to make a comment.

Please include the related paragraph number(s) where relevant to a comment.

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.10

Any comments?

Please leave blank if you have no comments

POLICY AF1: New and Improved Community Facilities

Any comments?

Please leave blank if you have no comments

POLICY AF2: Community Facility Change of Use

Any comments?

Please leave blank if you have no comments

POLICY AF3: Home-based and Small Businesses

Any comments?

Please leave blank if you have no comments

Back Next

Appendix 23 - Regulation 14 Closedown and Thank You Messages

Entry from March Newsletter

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

The Steering Group would like to thank everyone who took the time to respond to the recent Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation. They are now working with the Independent Consultant to analyse the comments received and amend the draft Plan, ensuring that it takes into account the NHDC emerging Local Plan as well as national and local planning law.

Neighbourhood Plan Website

The home page and Your Say pages changed to say thank you to respondents, and remove the link to the response form while still providing links to the documents.

[Home](#) [Our Parish](#) [Our Future](#) [Your Say](#) [More...](#)

Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say



The Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14) is now closed

Thank you to everyone who has responded to the consultation.

We have received responses from both residents and consultees (organisations with an interest in or responsibility for our parish). We are now collating and analysing all the comments to feed in to revisions of the plan.

Our intention is to have the next draft ready for submission to NHDC under Regulation 15 by the end of March 2018. This then leads to the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

Please note that replies received after the deadline cannot be considered.

Consultation, Survey and Results Documents

You can find the published draft versions of the plan (with supporting documents), survey questionnaires and results via the [Your Say](#) page.

Progress and Next Steps

The Neighbourhood Plan will describe our shared vision of what is important to us and how we want the Parish to develop over the next 13 years. The plan must have appropriate regard to national policy and conform to the strategic elements of the local plan. It must be compatible with EU obligations and the planning consultant will advise us on a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Needless to say it must also be based on up to date and robust evidence.

We are now at the pre-submission stage, known as Regulation 14, which commenced with a statutory 6 week consultation period – see above. During this time we consulted with all residents and also with the District Council, neighbouring parishes and other interested parties.



Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Our Parish - Our Future - Our Say

Your Say

The Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 14) is now closed

Thank you to everyone who has responded to the consultation.

We have received responses from both residents and consultees (organisations with an interest in or responsibility for our parish). We are now collating and analysing all the comments to feed in to revisions of the plan.

Our intention is to have the next draft ready for submission to NHDC under Regulation 15 by the end of March 2018. This then leads to the formal examination and consultation conducted by NHDC (Regulation 16).

Please note that replies received after the deadline cannot be considered.

You can view or download a copy following this link ...

[Preston Parish Neighbourhood Plan – draft version for the Regulation 14 Consultation](#)


There are a number of additional documents that are part of the statutory Neighbourhood Plan process. You can find the full set of documents by following these links:

[Draft Consultation Statement \(Regulation 14\) – January 2018](#)

[Basic Conditions Statement \(Regulation 14\) – January 2018](#)

[Preston Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening January 2018](#)

If you have any questions about the Neighbourhood Plan please use the [Contact the Steering Group](#) form or call our help line on 01462 434022 (9am to 8pm).



E-mail

Subject: PNS - Thank you from the Steering Group

From:

Date: 26/02/18 10:23

To:

Subject: Thank you from the Steering Group

Message: The Steering Group would like to thank everyone responded to the recent Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation. They are now working with the Independent Consultant to analyse the comments received and amend the draft Plan, ensuring that it takes into account the NHDC emerging Local Plan as well as national and local planning law.

Appendix 24 - Regulation 14 Positive Comments

There were 75 responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation of Preston Neighbourhood Plan, 65 of which were from local residents. The comments received which required action are in Appendix 25: Regulation 14 Comments and Actions Spreadsheet. This appendix acknowledges and records the positive comments which were received with appreciation by the Steering Group.

- I think it has been well thought out and is representative of my views for the future of Preston
- I am very happy with the plan as the input given by most of the Village seems to be an adequate reflection of our ideas and comments.
- Very happy with the gist of the plan and the big steps it takes in summing and defining what the people living here including those newer to Preston care about and what needs to flourish in the coming years
- I congratulate the whole team for the quality and scope of this Plan – and the enormous energy and commitment that has been required to reach this stage.
- The whole document is full of detail and hangs together extremely well, reflecting the history of the parish through to the present time. Congratulations to the Team for the months of hard work to finish with a document that will be so relevant to future parishioners in achieving the right balance of life and development in Preston Parish.
- This is a well thought out, well informed and researched plan, full of in depth local opinion and response with added local expertise and knowledge. It must be respected and honoured by planning authorities.
- This is a very well thought-out and informative Neighbourhood Plan. Very well done to all on the Steering Group.
- The historical setting has been so worthy of a read to set the background of the village, this Plan and thoughts for the future. I also found myself feeling proud and more determined to support the village as a consequence of reading this Consultation. I hope others do too. A tremendous job, very well done.
- Excellent work. This is a great document with large amounts of detail and clearly much effort has gone into its preparation. Thank you all.
- I am very happy with the draft plan, I have made I think important suggestions as above, but I think this is just a fantastic effort achieved.
- Huge thank you to the Steering Group for managing this massive project so competently and comprehensively. I feel in safe hands.
- Congratulations on such a well-researched and professional piece of work. Clearly a huge amount of effort has been put into it - and a thank you to all involved.
- I am truly grateful for the dedication and excellent work of the steering group and in particular Rae and Wally - thank you.
- Compliments to all on the Steering Committee for your efforts in guiding the village through the process of completing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Introductory Note

The spreadsheet on the following pages was a working document used to plan and track changes made in response to the Regulation 14 Consultation. The policy numbers refer to those in the Regulation 14 Draft Plan. The mapping table below is provided to help readers relate a policy number in this document to the Submission Draft Plan. The Policy Numbers in Sections 7, 8 and 11 are unchanged.

The running order of some policies in Section 10 Environment and Heritage was adjusted to improve the flow of related subject matter. Policy EH9 was removed from this section, then merged into Policy HD8 in Section 9 Housing and Development.

Regulation 14 Draft Plan – Table of Policies (Extract)

Submitted Draft Plan – Table of Policies (Extract)

9 HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

Policy HD1: Size of Individual Development:
 Policy HD2: Pedestrian Links and Rights of Way:
 Policy HD3: Housing Types:
 Policy HD4: Tenure of Housing:
 Policy HD5: Sustainability and Energy Efficiency:
 Policy HD6: Design:
 Policy HD7: Gardens:
Policy HD8: Drainage Provisions:
 Policy HD9: Residential Extensions:
 Policy HD10: New Housing Development:
 Policy HD11: Construction Management:

9 HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

Policy HD1: Size of Individual Development:
 Policy HD2: Pedestrian Links and Rights of Way:
 Policy HD3: Housing Types:
 Policy HD4: Tenure of Housing:
 Policy HD5: Sustainability and Energy Efficiency:
 Policy HD6: Design:
 Policy HD7: Gardens:
Policy HD8: Flood Risk and Drainage Provisions:
 Policy HD9: Residential Extensions:
 Policy HD10: New Housing Development:
 Policy HD11: Construction Management:

10 ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Policy EH1: Village Boundary:
 Policy EH2: Access to the Countryside:
 Policy EH3: Open and Green Spaces:
 Policy EH4: Distinct Villages:
 Policy EH5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies:
 Policy EH6: Protecting and Enhancing the Local Environment:
 Policy EH7: Conservation Areas and Heritage:
 Policy EH8: Views and Vistas:
Policy EH9: Flood Risk and Drainage:
 Policy EH10: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment:
 Policy EH11: Wildlife Sites:
 Policy EH12: Biodiversity:

10 ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Policy EH1: Village Boundary:
 Policy EH2: Distinct Villages:
 Policy EH3: Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets:
 Policy EH4: Open and Green Spaces:
 Policy EH5: Protecting and Enhancing the Local Environment:
 Policy EH6: Tranquillity and Dark Skies:
 Policy EH7: Views and Vistas:
 Policy EH8: Access to the Countryside:
 Policy EH9: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment:
 Policy EH10: Wildlife Sites:
 Policy EH11: Biodiversity:

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------|---|----------|
| 38 | | Parish | Para 3.19 St Martin's church east window, by Christopher Whall, was restored in 2005. | Para change | Add "2005" in the first sentence of the para. | ✓ |
| 38 | The spreadsheet on the following | 11.1 to 11.10 | Para. 11.1 - I would like to see an HGV ban imposed though the village. Para.11.3 - I believe the planning is now for 38M passengers per annum. Para. 11.9 - in my case there is no mobile coverage at all. | | Add reconsider request for a feasibility study on an HGV ban, to HCC's Locality budget through County Councillor, to the Project List. Amend ref in para 11.3 to Luton Airport 38m passengers target. | ✓ |
| 40 | | | As proposed new development is being reviewed for this area UK Power networks would need to know the amount of new residential or commercial development planning so we can evaluate the Electrical Load requirements needed for this proposal | No change | | |
| Regulation | | Submitted Draft Plan – Table of Policies (Extract) | The only comment I will request is that UK Power networks are consulted so we can work with the Proposed new development | Para change | Add an informative in paras 9.1-9.17, to consult with the power provider. | ✓ |
| 40 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | UK Power Networks will only need to know how many residential and commercial developments are being planned for | No change | | |
| 40 | HD1 | | UK Power Networks would need to know the size of the development for the Electrical Load requirements needed | No change | | |
| 40 | HD3 | | UK Power Networks would need to know the size of the development for the Electrical Load requirements needed | No change | | |
| 40 | HD5 | | UK Power Networks would need to know the size of the development for the Electrical Load requirements needed | No change | | |
| 40 | HD10 | | UK Power Networks would need to know the size of the development for the Electrical Load requirements needed | No change | | |
| 40 | HD11 | | UK Power Networks would need to know the size of the development for the Electrical Load requirements needed | No change | | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|--|--------|---|----------|
| 41 | | Appendix | <p>C.2. "The plan looks really excellent and I am sure it will enable the local community to shape the development that they want, whilst still resulting in measurable net gains to biodiversity. I have a few minor comments to make below. I am afraid I have lumped these all in to one box rather than split them out to the relevant sections. I hope you don't mind too much:</p> <p>1. p.75. D26. 'Species selected should be suitable to the soil conditions and be comprised of appropriate vegetation communities consistent with National Vegetation Communities (NVC)'. This should be changed to National Vegetation Classification communities (NVC)</p> <p>2. p 71 'D. Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment'</p> <p>'The following information and Policies have been provided to the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Preston Parish Council by Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre.'</p> <p>This should be changed to, 'The following information and Policies have been provided to the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Preston Parish Council by Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust.'</p> <p>3. p.58 'The Local Wildlife Sites</p> <p>There are 9 Local Wildlife Sites. The habitats include woodland, ponds and chalk grassland'. Is it possible to show these on a map? It might make things clearer for people.</p> <p>4. p.58 'The Local Wildlife Sites' 'Although the Local Wildlife Sites have no statutory protection, they need to be considered in the planning process through the Planning Policy Guidance, such as PP9 which refers to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 30. This states that nature conservation issues should be included in the surveys of local authority areas to ensure that the plans are based on fully adequate information about local species, habitats, geology and landforms. Plans should be concerned not only with designated areas, but also with other land of conservation value and the possible provision of new habitats.'</p> <p>PPS9 is no longer a statutory document and has been replaced with the National Planning and Policy Framework. Would it be better to replace the paragraph above with this phrase adapted from NPPF?</p> <p>Although Local Wildlife Sites have no statutory protection, they need to be considered in the planning process through the guidance provided by the National Planning and Policy Framework 2012, which states that to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, and promote their preservation and restoration. Plans should be concerned not only with designated areas, but also with other land of conservation value and the possible provision of new habitats.'</p> | | Appendix D to be changed as suggested by the Wildlife Trust | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|---------------|--|----------|
| 44 | | Objective | Objective H9 - housing scheme to be of appropriate scale and maintain character of village. With regard to the objectives and policies relating to Housing and Development, I believe that the housing growth strategy should be informed by an over-arching objective that any further new housing be appropriate, proportionate and consistent with the existing rural character and needs of the village. This is alluded to in Objective H9 and section 9.1 of the Plan, but in my view requires greater emphasis. I would suggest that Objective H9 be amended to read as follows: "To seek to ensure that any new housing development is appropriate, proportionate to and consistent with the existing character, infrastructure and needs of the village". I also suggest it be given more prominence by making it Objective H2. | No change | Suggested wording is too prescriptive and implies that the infrastructure or needs of the village will not change over time. | |
| 44 | | Objective | Objective E5 - to take special care of the Conservation Area. I feel that this Objective should be clearer and stronger. Is the Parish opposed to all housing development within the Conservation Area? Or that there should be a presumption that all other alternatives are first considered? Or simply that it is even more imperative that any development within the Conservation Area should be "appropriate, proportionate and consistent..." (in which case it should be appropriate, proportionate and consistent with the Conservation Area itself and not just the village as a whole)? | Obj change | To take special care of the Conservation Area, ensure that development in the Conservation Area or its setting is of an appropriate scale and maintains or enhances its character, and to raise awareness of the relevant legislation. | ✓ |
| 44 | | Objective | Objective H2 - access ways and pathways: The comments above regarding roadways equally apply to potential access ways for any new development. I note Objective H2, that new developments should link into or enhance paths and rights of way. However, this should not entail any material increase in level of use, or change in use (e.g. from pedestrian to vehicular), of existing access ways and pathways. The level and type of use should be consistent with the existing use, and with the intention behind the original grant of any right of way, taking into account any restrictions or covenants over the land which the right of way serves. The use of the right of way should also take into account the rights of existing residents who live adjacent to the right of way, including the right to privacy and quiet enjoyment of their property and garden. I suggest Objective H2 be amended to read as follows: "To ensure that, in seeking to integrate new residents into the village, wherever possible new developments link into existing access ways or pathways - provided that this does not entail any material increase in level of use, or change in type of use (e.g. from pedestrian to vehicular) of existing rights of way, or adversely impact the rights of existing residents or landowners". | Policy change | Amend Policy HD10. Insert "and green lanes" after "green spaces". Add a sentence to the end of the policy as follows: "New access arrangements should be safe, not negatively impact on the existing road network and should not impact on the character of the rural lanes in the Parish. | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|--|---------------|---|----------|
| 44 | | Objective | New Objective H6 - infrastructure and roadways. Additionally, when considering the location of any new development, it is imperative that full consideration is given to the ability of the village infrastructure (roadways, access ways, drainage etc) to support such new development. The main roadways through the heart of the village (School Lane, Back Lane, Chequers Lane) are already over-utilised, particularly bearing in mind the influx of traffic to the nursery school, village hall, PHC and primary school. These roads are narrow, with limited passing places and parking, and their rural character should be maintained (Objectives T4 and E3). Whilst the impact on infrastructure is referred to in Objective H7, I feel this Objective should address services and utilities, and the impact on roadway infrastructure should be addressed in a separate objective, as follows: "To seek to ensure, when considering the scale and location of any new development, that the existing roadways and infrastructure will be able to accommodate such development and increase in level of use, without degradation of their rural character (c.f. Objectives T4 and E3)". | Policy change | See change to HD10 | |
| 44 | HD2 | | Implementation of this policy should not entail any material increase in level of use, or change in use (e.g. from pedestrian to vehicular), of existing access ways and pathways. The level and type of use should be consistent with the existing use, and with the intention behind the original grant of any right of way, taking into account any restrictions or covenants over the land which the right of way serves. The use of the right of way should also take into account the rights of existing landowners and residents who live adjacent to the right of way, including the right to privacy and quiet enjoyment of their property and garden. | Policy change | See change to HD10 | ✓ |
| 48 | | Objective | Objective E2 The document clearly needs to emphasize the opportunities open to walkers, cyclists and horse riders to enjoy the countryside but I do think the word "legal" should prefix the reference to footpaths, cycleways and bridleways. Present use by the visiting public sadly has been falling short of village expectations. Folk walk and cycle where there are no legal rights of way e.g. walking and cycling in parts of Wain Wood (our site of special interest), cycling across the cricket ground whilst cricket is being played in order to access Wain Wood and, believe it or not, even cycling across the square while payers eat tea. We should support folk wanting to visit but they have to abide by the rules to protect this special place. | Obj change | Add "statutory and permissive" between 'of' and footpath' in Objective E2 | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------------------|----------------|--|-----------|--|----------|
| 48 | | 6.5 to 6.8 | <p>I would definitely include the creation of the Preston Trust. Although it is referred to elsewhere in the document, I think it should be recognised as an achievement, alongside the Red Lion and our response to Broadband.</p> <p>The Trust has played a significant community role in financing the cricket pavilion and in preserving the village green and pond area from urban development planned by PHC in their grounds in the early '90s. The Trust has also supported the village school and the church with their special projects.</p> | No change | Comment noted | |
| 48 | Policy EH2: Access | | Presumably Policy AF2 would not prevent a relocation of the Village Hall, if somewhere better, larger, with parking and of benefit to the village could be found. I know it is talked about. | No change | This assumption is correct. | |
| 48 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | <p>9.15 - 21 Houses in Butchers Lane / Chequers Lane</p> <p>This development will obviously bring a huge increase in road traffic and pedestrian risk to villagers, as well as an inevitable impact on property values. The traffic issues specific to this development clearly need to be addressed by the Planners.</p> | No change | Agree that traffic will increase but Housing and Transport policies cover this point. | |
| 48 | | 10.15 to 10.17 | <p>10.17</p> <p>I have had it confirmed by the RSPB that there are a pair of Ravens now at PHC. I have seen and heard them over the last 18 months. Also there are several Owls in the grounds. Little Owls and, a few weeks ago, there were two Brown Owls standing in the middle of the Hitchin Road, late at night.</p> | No change | This information is pleasing to hear. | |
| 49 | | Objective | <p>Objectives H1-H10 and Policies HD1-HD11.</p> <p>I am in broad agreement with the Objectives and Policies relating to Housing and Development, but feel that more emphasis needs to be placed upon</p> <p>1) the preservation of the character of Preston as a rural village;</p> <p>2) the assessment of the suitability of, and impact on, not only any identified development site but also the surrounding infrastructure (particularly roadways and access-ways) to accommodate any development (without derogation from 1 above);</p> <p>2) consideration of the rights of existing residents to the quiet enjoyment of their properties when assessing the location, extent and nature of any proposed development (including any development or increase in use of roadways, rights of way and access-ways in the vicinity).</p> <p>With regard to Objective E3, I agree that the protection of 'greenspace' should include the preservation of grassed areas, verges, hedgerows and rights of way and feel strongly that there should be no change of use (eg from pedestrian to vehicular, grass to tarmac) or significant increase in the level of use of such areas.</p> | No change | No further action required other than the reply to comments by ID 44 & ID 48 with regard to footpaths. The character of the village and the preservation of that character is well documented in the plan. | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-------------|--|--------------|---|----------|
| 49 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | Objectives H1-H10 and Policies HD1-HD11. I am in broad agreement with the Objectives and Policies relating to Housing and Development, but feel that more emphasis needs to be placed upon 1) the preservation of the character of Preston as a rural village; 2) the assessment of the suitability of, and impact on, not only any identified development site but also the surrounding infrastructure (particularly roadways and access-ways) to accommodate any development (without derogation from 1 above); 2) consideration of the rights of existing residents to the quiet enjoyment of their properties when assessing the location, extent and nature of any proposed development (including any development or increase in use of roadways and access-ways in the vicinity). | No change | As response to comments ID49 - Paragraph 9.1 to 9.17 | |
| 49 | HD2 | | When assessing the location and nature of any housing development, it is equally necessary to consider: 1) the suitability of, and impact on, the surrounding infrastructure (particularly roadways and access-ways) to accommodate any development (without derogation from the objective of preserving the character of Preston as a rural village); 2) the rights of existing residents to the quiet enjoyment of their properties (particularly those living in the vicinity not only of the development site but also the impacted roadways, rights of way and access-ways). | No change | As response to similar comments by ID 49 and comments by ID 44 and ID 48 | |
| 49 | EH3 | | I agree that this should include the preservation of grassed areas, verges, hedgerows and rights of way and feel strongly that there should be no change of use (eg from pedestrian to vehicular, grass to tarmac) or significant increase in the level of use of such areas. | No change | As response to similar comments by ID 49 and comments by ID 44 and ID 48 | |
| 52 | | Objective | E1- Add "and in particular to limit the proliferation of signage" | No change | The plan has not highlighted a proliferation of signage or that it is a particular problem. | |
| 52 | | Objective | E3- After protect add "and improve" | Obj change | Amend E4 as proposed: add "and improve" after "protect" | ✓ |
| 52 | | Objective | E5- Vague. Suggest "Ensure that any changes proposed in the Conservation Area are fully in accordance with the Objectives of this Plan" | Obj change | See change ID 44 | ✓ |
| 52 | | Objective | H9- Any new housing must be appropriate and in proportion to and in keeping with the character of the village and take full account of the new demands placed on infrastructure. | Project list | H9 covers the first part of the comment and infrastructure is dealt with in T5. Add seeking improvements to infrastructure in the Project List. | ✓ |
| 52 | | Objective | T2- Suggest "safe and legal use of.." | No change | Legal matters are not relevant in a Neighbourhood Plan. Comment noted. | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|------------|--|----------------|---|----------|
| 52 | | Objective | T4- Add "and in particular to preserve and maintain the verges" | Obj change | Delete Objective T4 and amend Objective E1 to read "To protect and enhance the rural character and environment of the parish, and its varied landscapes." Renumber Objective T5 as T4. Lanes and verges are now covered in policy HD10. Amend Objective H10 to add "and verges" after "narrow lanes". | ✓ |
| 52 | | 7.1 to 7.5 | Might there be a new H11 "To discourage howsoever possible the installation and use of Garden Floodlighting"? Might this also come under "dark skies" in policy EH5? | Section change | Not reasonable to prevent someone lighting their outside space but EH5 is not really covered by an Objective. Rearrange text and policies in the Environment Section so policies relate to better to objectives. Expand Objective E4 to include tranquillity. | ✓ |
| 52 | HD1 | | HD1- Any development of more than 5 homes is certain to breach the spirit of the Plan's Objectives. Suggest that small scale is not just "preferred" but "will be permitted". Omit provisos about justification and Strategic Assessments. | No change | "Will be permitted" would imply any small development would be acceptable. | |
| 52 | HD2 | | HD2- Any material increase in volume or type of use of roads and paths should not adversely affect the character of the village and must respect the existing rights and interests of adjoining owners. | No change | This policy is not about roads. See also comments on ID 44 | |
| 52 | HD4 | | HD4- Proposals in general should provide a mix - NOT each individual proposal. Suggest add "Over the period of the Plan..." and "with each proposal being judged on it's merits" | Policy change | Agreed. Add "over the plan period" at the end of the new policy wording suggested at ID NH | ✓ |
| 52 | HD6 | | HD6- Add "The privacy,sunlight,daylight and outlook of existing adjoining residents must be respected" | No change | Privacy and daylight are covered by planning legislation, residents do not have a right to a view. | |
| 52 | HD11 | | HD11- Add " to protect the character of the narrow lanes in the village and avoid damage to those lanes and their verges". Omit "viable route" and insert "means of access" to ensure suitable sized vehicles are used. | Policy change | Add " to protect the character of the narrow lanes in the village and avoid damage to those lanes and their verges" after "protected," and replace "viable route" with "means of access". | ✓ |
| 52 | EH8 | | EH8- Add "and sustainable" to appropriate mitigation measures. | No change | Not sure what this would achieve. | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|---------------|---|----------|
| 52 | | Appendix | <p>HERC5- Omit "suitable development" and substitute "Where any development impacts bat or bird populations.</p> <p>HERC1 and 2- After "Impact Calculator " add "and/or any revised methodology approved by DEFRA or any relevant successor authority"</p> <p>HERC9- Omit all after "adverse lighting impacts" and add "to adjoins owners and occupiers or wildlife the PPC will expect proposals to limit intrusive effects on neighbours and surveys to identify wildlife movements with proposals to ensure such movements are protected and enhanced"</p> <p>HERC10- Insert after "PPC will expect that" the extra words "an appropriate mix of native species is used" Recent research by RHS has proved mixtures are much more effective than single species.</p> | Policy change | <p>The wording of the appendix was provided by the Wildlife Trust and the only amendments should be the ones they have proposed see ID 41.</p> <p>E.g. some developments might not be suitable for bat and bird boxes. However, adding "and/or any revised methodology approved by DEFRA or any relevant successor authority" into HERC1 would cover all eventualities.</p> <p>This future proofs the policy.</p> | ✓ |
| 53 | | Vision | <p>My comments may not be relevant. I don't disagree with anything in this Vision but it does read very broad, vague and general and could perhaps equally apply to many hundreds of locations, I cannot just see anything specific to or promoting Preston, or any specific emphasis, there are no USPs. I'm thinking that lots of v. different places could use it.</p> <p>Here in Preston we have inherited many natural features that we cherish and want to preserve rather than lose them, and enhance/ protect/ build on them, - whether it's the country village character and feel with its scattering of individual cottages & houses, or the established hedgerows and ancient magnificent nature of trees, woods, flora and wildlife, winding lanes, and then on to incorporating modern developments/ transport/ technology without losing sight of the village's heritage, etc.</p> <p>Striving to keep and protect the attractiveness and beauty of the village and its surrounds, and setting, doesn't get a mention. (???)</p> | No change | <p>Too late to change the vision at this point. The description given could also be applied to lots of other places. Comment noted.</p> | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|---------------|--|-------------|---|----------|
| 53 | | Objective | <p>I support all of these.</p> <p>Quality of life: I might be tempted to put Q1 at the end after the other two, and to put 'country village community' or similar in Q2, we are more than 'just' a community. You have some good words in here.</p> <p>Amenities etc: A1 could be 'To support and find opportunities to enhance...etc'</p> <p>Housing: I'd love to see a bit more of nature coming in here, NHDC Planning (John Chapman) once talked to us about putting in a 'wildlife strip' around our affordable houses layout, and he said thereby 'achieving eco-points which are a relevant consideration in planning applications'. I got the impression from the questionnaire analysis that there was a degree of emphasis for increasing the numbers of smaller properties in any new developments incl. v. small developments, though if correct then this is not coming across from the H&D objectives. New houses to reflect/ enhance the rural nature of the village where feasible (could be added to H3?). H9 has a bit of this on the end and is good to keep in anyway, though H9 is more about the scale of developments.</p> <p>Everything you already have is good.</p> <p>Environment: I felt there was a theme in the questionnaire results to have undeveloped green spaces around for a variety of purposes, perhaps in my interpretation as sitting out in a peaceful spot while the kids are playing or whatever and pick the buttercups or watch the insects.</p> | No change | <p>The objectives are not numbered in order of importance.</p> <p>Q2 is more about quality of life in general.</p> <p>"New ventures" covers "opportunities to enhance".</p> <p>Biodiversity calculator and the HERC appendix covers this point.</p> <p>The word "range" in H3 covers various sizes of home. HD3 includes "a range of sizes:."</p> | |
| 53 | | 6.1 to 6.4 | Is this one a typo in 6.1, should maybe read '...into five themes...' i.e. without the words 'the same' ? | No change | The objectives and the policies are grouped into the same five themes | |
| 53 | | 8.1 to 8.10 | In 8.6 could we point out a concern to try and preserve some spaces around the village for just such facilities in the future? We don't really have anywhere even where youngsters could hang out, kick a ball around. | No change | Such joint facilities do not exist at present so can't preserve them. | |
| 53 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | Something in the objectives on p.30 about protecting our existing/ winding (side-)lanes? e.g. we don't want a Butchers Lane road widening scheme when or if PR1 gets developed? | No change | A neighbourhood plan would have little influence on the need to provide highway safety, although we are suggesting changes highlighting the importance of the rural lanes. | |
| 53 | EH3 | | At the top of p38, 2nd line: Open spaces of particular importance include The Green etc. ... (? ... and the field next to the Primary School). | No change | The field is privately owned and not sufficiently special to be included. | |
| 53 | | 11.1 to 11.10 | I know section 11 is on transport but I think 11.1 should start The biggest concern under this heading for residents of Preston etc... | Para change | Amend para 11.1 as suggested | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|---------------|--|-------------|--|----------|
| 53 | TC2 | | TC2 seems to need an ending along the lines: It is clear that this would need specific additional investment to cater for new additional users while not diluting/ overloading the present limited coverage for the existing village. Last line in the box at bottom of p43: ... the current criteria.... etc | Para change | Include "current" in box on speed limit change. The point about TC2 is already covered by "adverse impact". | ✓ |
| 56 | | 7.1 to 7.5 | 7.4 Preston is relatively quiet and tranquil, but it should be strongly noted here that with the aggressive expansion plans of Luton Airport, who are forecasting a more than doubling of the current number of annual passengers to 38 million by the late 2030's, there is a real risk that this tranquillity will be badly eroded by the resultant number of aircraft passing over or close by the village. | No change | Although this statement is no doubt true the neighbourhood plan cannot influence Luton's decision to expand the airport. | |
| 56 | | 11.1 to 11.10 | 11.3 Again, it is absolutely correct to highlight the potential for a sharp increase in vehicle traffic through the village, should the planned airport expansion numbers become reality, but I also think it important to focus on the damage that the airport expansion itself could have to the peace and tranquillity of our village, with the potential for incessant and loud aircraft noise passing over, or very close by, depending on where the air traffic route is set in the future. | No change | See comment on ID 56 para 7.4 | |
| 58 | | Objective | 5.1 AND Objective H9 - I do not like in-filling development which risks damaging the character of the village, both in the removal of open spaces, and the style of the houses. I do recognise, however, that this is preferable to expansion of the village boundary since destroying green belt would cause irreversible damage to the parish on many more levels. Objective E2 - some pathways seem to allow 4x4 vehicles (Dead Woman's Lane) which should be prevented wherever possible since it does not encourage walking, riding, or the peace of the village | No change | Comment noted | |
| 58 | | 11.1 to 11.10 | 11.1 There is a typo "20pmh" should of course be "20mph" 11.5 I would argue that Church Lane is also single-track in some places - it is very common to see cars have to wait for others to pass since the size of cars on average are large now than they were 10+ years ago. | | Amend typo in 11.1 Two cars can pass with care. | ✓ |
| 60 | | Objective | Objective T2: Totally agree with this statement as a whole. However there is one road in particular, School Lane where this falls down as it is particularly dangerous for cyclists, horse riders or pedestrians. This is due to the road being too narrow and a blind bend just before Kiln Wood Cottage. | No change | Comment noted. | |
| 60 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | 9.15 Detailed drainage strategy needs to be greatly reconsidered as the 6 houses already built in Castle Field are already causing problems (smells, sewage blockages etc) to both Chequers Lane and Back lane, greatly impacting on the lives of the existing residents. | No change | Comment noted. | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|---------------|--|---------------|---|----------|
| 60 | HD2 | | As a result of the 6 houses already built in Castlefield, it has become apparent that there is a need for a pedestrian footpath for parents and children walking down Chequers Lane to either go to the village schools or the bus stop. Currently there is nothing except walking on the lane itself and this is proving hazardous at certain times of day. The traffic has also become busier and faster as a result of the extra housing at this end of the village too. | No change | The Lane is not wide enough for a footpath and the provision of a footpath could only be achieved on private land (the front gardens of each home on the lane). | |
| 60 | HD10 | | It is vital to maintain, for example, hedgerows, tree belts, important vistas and footpaths while avoiding 'cramming' new development within our built environment – be it extending existing structures or adding new ones. | No change | Comment noted. | |
| 64 | | 11.1 to 11.10 | The plan acknowledges that public transport is poor and villagers rely on their cars. I think the point should be made that inadequate long-term parking in Hitchin poses real problems for villagers. Those wishing to travel to London by train after peak hours often find the station car park and Queen Mother car parks full. This means parking more than a mile from the station, which is unacceptable and may be impossible for those less mobile. Hitchin is outside the parish but the lack of long-term parking in Hitchin impinges significantly on the lives of those who live in the parish | No change | The neighbourhood plan cannot influence anything outside its boundary. | |
| 64 | TC2 | | I disagree with the caveat on provision of broadband and mobile coverage, namely "provided they do not conflict with other policies in this Plan". While I think it unlikely that such conflicts will arise, broadband and mobile coverage have become such essential aspects of human life that I do not think they should be sacrificed because of some perceived conflict with other plan policies. Indeed a recent United Nations report classifies access to broadband as a human right (https://www.thoughtco.com/united-nations-broadband-access-is-a-basic-human-right-436784). There is a growing body of opinion that the same is true of mobile coverage (eg http://www.mobileactive.org/is-mobile-access-a-human-right/). Much of Preston has no mobile signal. | Policy change | Well made point and a more positive wording might help. Amend TC2 to replace "do not conflict" with "are sensitively designed and located in and accord". | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|-----------|---|----------|
| 66 | | Intro | <p>Dear Team,</p> <p>Please pass on my congratulations for a comprehensive document, thus far. Obviously a lot of work has gone into this and will obviously continue to be and for that, many thanks.</p> <p>A few questions from me...</p> <p>1. What are the criteria when the time comes to select the property developers? I feel this is very important. I would argue most property developers don't know Preston or understand how hugely valuable this is to all of us to get right. Surely their main aim (as a property business) is to make as much money as they can. I think this needs to be thought about very carefully. When the initial Castlefield development was initiated, a company that advertised itself as a Charity / Hosting Association was chosen to build / manage the houses. After not very long the diggers moved in, the property prices for these newly proposed houses went up by nearly £100K. When I enquired why this was so from the PC, I got an answer that basically said "the developers undervalued the property prices in Preston".</p> <p>Whether the PC was hoodwinked / mis-directed / lied-to - it led to some bad feeling. Local young families could no longer move in.</p> <p>I know several people from either the Cricket Club or local friends who's give their right arm to live in Preston - and contribute to being here - kids in school, use pub, play cricket, etc. It would be a terrible pity to price out again the exact people we are trying to attract because the developer chosen see's £ signs. There were a lot of very upset people who genuinely felt let down and that they had the rug pulled from under them for the sake of more money. Who we use is of huge importance in my view.</p> <p>2. Will there be a local offering initially to known families for these new properties? i.e. will people we know who are looking to get into Preston be given some sort of heads-up? Again, when previous Castlefield properties were built, conditions were set up that people with local connections to the village would be given some sort of priority. I feel this needs to happen again.</p> <p>What we simply must avoid is the purchase of these homes by individuals with no ties to our</p> | No change | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan policies cannot influence the selection of a developer. Affordable homes will be offered first to local people according to the points system of housing need.</p> <p>It is very difficult for a Neighbourhood Plan to influence traffic and highways although some protection for rural lanes has been included. See also other comments and responses.</p> | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|--------|-----------------|----------|
| | | | <p>3. Traffic will become a very big deal to many of us. There was a lot of mention in the report around connections via footpaths etc to encourage local community feel etc, which I understand. But I couldn't see that much - apologies if I missed it - around provision from the influx of new residents around speed limits, space for cars and how we deal with an increasingly congested Chequers Lane. Will there be access via Butchers Lane - with loss of hedgerows potentially? With 21 new houses surely we can bang the drum again to make everything 20 mph. I would also suggest that in time most 3 bed property owners are potentially likely to have more than one car.</p> <p>I am in full-support of what we are doing on this. I'm a believer that Preston; if we are not too careful, is an ageing village - we need new, young blood. I think the generations before wanted to protect Preston - which I do totally understand and quite rightly - but we also have to look to the future and this is therefore a hugely encouraging document to read.</p> <p>I know there is a feeling amongst people certainly in my circles that Preston is a closed shop. In the last 4 months, two houses have been bought within the immediate environs of the village green and not lived in by those who bought them. For people with the bucks, why not? But I personally feels that's a terrible shame. We must do what we can to attract young families into the village. Those that are new to the village, who I know, and all living in Castlefield at the moment as it happens, are already contributing hugely. One is on the PC and someone else if already a Governor at the School and already making strides to improve the sports facilities for the children. Something that is lacking a great deal. Excellent. More of them please.</p> <p>Thanks - just some initial thoughts from me. But again many thanks to you all for all your hard work.</p> | | | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|------------|---|-----------------------|---|----------|
| 70 | | Intro | <p>Without seeking to offend in any way – in essence, I feel this Neighbourhood Plan has the character of being defensive. It seeks to protect and defend the status quo. While this is in itself laudable, it does not identify opportunities, nor offer proposals, for future appropriate development. It leaves that to others to consider...within the framework of standards to be respected.</p> <p>The proposal within the Local Plan for an allocation of 21 homes off Templar's Way (Site Ref PR1) covers an area of land that is inadequate for the designated number of houses...if the policies expressed in this Plan for character etc. are enforced. Where is it suggested the balance of homes should go?</p> <p>Therefore, I feel this Plan – and the Local Plan – lack studies that identify appropriate development opportunities that can be built, consistent with the stated aims and objectives for the quality of environment the Plan seeks to achieve.</p> <p>Studies for future development opportunities could be explored and discussed with proper consultation without opening up a 'hornets nest' by ensuring they are strictly limited to the designated village boundary</p> | No change | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>PR1 site allocation is a proposal in the Local Plan. The plan does not seek to allocate additional housing sites and the policies within the plan will act as a guide to what is appropriate for the village and influence any future housing or other development proposals.</p> | |
| 70 | | Objective | <p>Living in Preston (Quality of Life)</p> <p>Q1 & QL1 suggest 'education' is added, as 3 schools are in the village all of whom would benefit from change in the future.</p> | Obj and Policy change | Add "education before "cultural" in Objective Q1. Add "education" before "culturally" in QL1. | ✓ |
| 70 | | 7.1 to 7.5 | <p>Q1 & QL1 suggest 'education' is added, as 3 schools are in the village all of whom would benefit from change in the future.</p> <p>I feel we need to identify facilities that would serve and benefit the community as examples of those where a contribution would be appropriate as a result of granting consent for additional housing/commercial development.</p> <p>I suggest, as examples:</p> <p>A new Nursery School – with a play area that can be supervised – and adequate parking for staff and space for parents to 'meet & greet'.</p> <p>A new Village Hall – with parking. This facility could offer space that could be used by the nursery school.</p> <p>If these two facilities were to be sited adjacent to the current JMI School – on the adjacent land (within the village boundary) – they would complement each other and offer the opportunity to resolve the current inadequacy of all these facilities.</p> <p>Such a development could – I would suggest – be supported by the Parish Council who could contribute funds, following the sale of the current Village Hall.</p> | Project list | Add a section on the Project List about S106 contributions for community facilities. | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|--|--------------|--|----------|
| 70 | QL3 | | <p>I feel it would be worth while to develop – as emerging proposals within the period of the Neighbourhood Plan – Supplementary Planning Guidance based on research to cover two specific areas:</p> <p>1. The Location and Design of Small Residential Developments’</p> <p>2. Historic Buildings: Repairs, Alterations and Extensions’</p> <p>Such guidance would encourage a high standard of design appropriate to the character of Preston. If it would be helpful, I suggest part funding for such work could be initiated by The Preston Trust, and possibly ‘crowd funding’ within the community.</p> <p>Conservation Area</p> <p>There is a significant case for an additional Conservation Area to be designated to include all the Listed Buildings near Ladygrove Farm, including woodlands.</p> <p>The current Conservation Area was studied prior to it’s establishment in 1980. These studies were conducted to evaluate and describe:</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest, including Listed buildings and previously listed Grade 3 buildings. Statutory Listed walls, gates & railings, recent buildings, post 1939, important building line, important walls, gates and railings, trees of High, Medium, & Low amenity value, areas of High Landscape & Townscape value, important pedestrian ways, important views, focal points.</p> <p>I feel it would be constructive if a re-appraisal of these features was conducted and extend it to assess the viability and desirability of adding a further Conservation Area around Ladygrove etc.</p> | Project list | Add the production of two potential additional documents to supplement the Neighbourhood Plan; for the location and design of small residential developments and repairs, alternations and extensions to historic buildings. | ✓ |
| 70 | HD4 | | <p>So far the cost of 'affordable homes' has been higher than can attract occupiers...so a more realistic approach is required.</p> | No change | Affordable homes for sale or rent are provided at below market value e.g. social rent is no more than 80% of market rent. When property prices are high as in Preston, homes may only be affordable if provided through a community housing scheme. This option could be considered if suitable land was to be donated and considering the feasibility of this option will be added to the Project List. | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|--------------|---|----------|
| 70 | HD9 | | <p>I particularly object to the last sentence of this Policy. Extensions under this policy could be no more than 2metres apart! There is far greater control I feel, if the first part of the sentence is retained up to 'safeguarded' – omitting thereafter, 'and the extension must be ...etc...of the property.'</p> <p>...in addition (as below) the aim should seek to ensure that any development does not either involve, or could lead to, 'cramming' buildings, access, storage, and incidental features such as sheds & greenhouses within the built environment.</p> | No change | Policy amended in accordance with comments by ID NH. Incidental features in the curtilage of a dwelling house can only be controlled through an Article 4 direction (primarily relevant in conservation areas). | |
| 70 | HD10 | | <p>Ensure that any development contributes to the provision of enhanced facilities to benefit the community. Such contributions to be in proportion to the scale of any development.</p> <p>The aim should also seek to ensure that any development does not either involve, or could lead to, 'cramming' buildings, access, storage, and incidental features such as sheds & greenhouses within the built environment.</p> | No change | See comment ID 70 on policy HD9 | |
| 70 | EH7 | | <p>There is a significant case for an additional Conservation Area to be designated to include all the Listed Buildings near Ladygrove Farm, including woodlands.</p> <p>The current Conservation Area was studied prior to it's establishment in 1980. These studies were conducted to evaluate and describe:</p> <p>Buildings of Local Interest, including Listed buildings and previously listed Grade 3 buildings.</p> <p>Statutory Listed walls, gates & railings</p> <p>Recent buildings, post 1939</p> <p>Important building line</p> <p>Important walls, gates and railings</p> <p>Trees of High, Medium, & Low amenity value</p> <p>Areas of High Landscape & Townscape value</p> <p>Important pedestrian ways</p> <p>Important views</p> <p>Focal points</p> <p>I feel it would be highly constructive if a re-appraisal of these features was conducted as part of this current Neighbourhood Plan work, and extend it to assess the viability and desirability of adding a further Conservation Area around Ladygrove etc</p> | Project List | Add the investigation of a second conservation area to include Ladygrove Farm to the Project List | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|----------|
| 71 | | Vision | Preston has somehow managed to retain a lot of its earliest character and features despite the unrelenting pressures of recent decades, there are fragile values throughout the village that have been cared for and have somehow survived to a degree, to preserve something of the lanes, mature hedgerows, native wildlife, scattered houses and cottages, green spaces, and the community, and we have to work hard to retain and consolidate what heritage still remains, while integrating it with the ongoing developments as we embrace and adapt to all the changes and growth and the technological advances of current times. | Obj and Policy change | There are many comments about character and this has not been adequately covered. Objective E1 has been amended to include 'character'. Add a new policy EH1 and renumber subsequent policies to read "All development proposals must demonstrate how local character has been taken into account during conception and evolution of the design. Proposals that do not positively contribute to local character must explain why and demonstrate the reasons behind the alternative approach. Add supporting text in a new paragraph 10.15 and renumber subsequent paragraphs. | ✓ |
| 71 | | Objective | Living in Preston/ Quality of Life is correct as No. 1, then the good order of Amenities, and of Housing and Development also near the top. Living in Preston could be ramped up a little such as what I am trying to give the essence of in my previous points under Vision. | No change | Comment noted. | |
| 71 | | 6.5 to 6.8 | This is a good section. Yes, important to list several examples. Could well add the cricket pavilion and ground as another example here too, of community action that brought a fresh momentum so that in our tiny village we now have a Club fielding something like 6 or more teams/ sides each week and a major element in the county. Then the challenges at the millennium to decide whether to let our 100 year old parish church fade, or to tackle the huge pressing refurbishment and re-roofing inside and out, through volunteer village painters and decorators, as well as outside tradesmen financed through fundraising events that were aimed at and supported by both local communities and district visitors (concerts, quizzes, gardens open days) bringing in a 6 figure total without being dependent on villagers alone. | Para change | The Pavilion and church refurbishment could be added as pioneering community ventures? The details of community involvement in these schemes is still being investigated. | ✓ |
| 71 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | Whenever two or more new houses are proposed the development should without exception include one or more 2- to 3-bedroom properties, the smaller houses to be built AND PRICED 'affordably'. | No change | Insufficient evidence to support this. | |
| 71 | HD4 | | Perhaps some better/ more social housing, but also and in particular a stronger element/ emphasis for more affordable housing and more for OAPs. Residents of working age need really to be able to run or have access to a car out here. | No change | Comment noted. | |
| 71 | EH3 | | Sustain and treasure the remaining open and green spaces that we have, too many have disappeared or are due to be built on, these spaces are needed as Green Lungs for the villagers, village wildlife and flora, for sitting and walking, for children to play close to home. | No change | Comment noted. | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-------------|--|---------------|---|----------|
| 76 | | 6.5 to 6.8 | I think the intention behind policies CR1-CR3 needs to be made clearer. | Policy change | These policies should become paragraphs. | ✓ |
| 93 | | Intro | I am making one comment only (in section 5) This is because of time constraints Leaving it blank does not mean I approve | No change | Comment noted. | |
| 93 | | 5.1 | The following statement (pasted in quotes at the end of this box) in the policy is untrue. A significant number of residents notified NHDC their objections to PR1. Therefore the inference that the community understands and accepts the plans to develop Templars lane (PR1) site is untrue. The sentence MUST be modified accordingly "The community understands the need to accommodate housing growth over the next 13 years and accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011- 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane. | Para change | Add "majority" after "The" in first sentence of para 5.1 Add in the number of people who objected at Pre-submission stage to the site allocation, when this is known. | ✓ |
| 94 | | Vision | I am unsure what you mean by "sustainable development". This phrase is used by the UN in the global context of the Sustainable Development Goals, but I suspect your ambition is rather more focused. Given that it is an over-used phrase, it would probably help to define or focus it further with a more specific definition | Para change | Reference the NPPF in relation to sustainability in para 1.6 | ✓ |
| 94 | | 6.1 to 6.4 | > Ensure that the multitude of individual decisions add up to something coherent for the area as a whole (paragraphs 58, 70, 109, 126) How? What mechanisms will be used to arrive at a consensus? And what will be the process for non-consensus? It is not clear how the NP arrives at a mandate. Please clarify the process beyond what has already been achieved. | Para change | Add after "Parish Council," in last sentence "will be added to the Project List and". Information on the next stage in the process will be added to the website | ✓ |
| 94 | | 8.1 to 8.10 | 8.6 - a shop is not a particular priority. Given that the vast majority of residents drive and have reason to go beyond the village on a daily basis, contact with shops etc is a routine occurrence. Although this was flagged as being important in the questionnaire, this was more likely an outcome from how the question overly framed in a directive manner | Para change | Amend para 8.6 . Remove the "!" after "shop". Add after desired "in the survey results. The shop could be a community run business and the feasibility of a community shop will be added to the Project List". | ✓ |
| 94 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | Why has PR1 been deemed an acceptable site for development? Nowhere in the NP is a justification for this site, but instead a rather disingenuous assert in 5.1 that "The community understands the need to accommodate housing growth over the next 13 years and accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane". This sentence conflates two things - the acceptance of the (imposed) targets from NHDC for new homes, and the acceptance of the plans for site PR1. It is categorically not correct to suggest the community in PP universally accept the proposals for PR1. | Para change | Para 5.1 will be changed in response to this - see change against ID93 para 5.1 | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|---------------|--|----------|
| 94 | HD1 | | Smaller developments are preferred, so again this speaks against PR1 | No change | The policy would allow a phased development of PR1 and is not prescriptive only 'preferring' small-scale proposals appropriate to the size of the village. | |
| 94 | HD10 | | Again, this policy speaks eloquently against PR1 | No change | If the scheme on PR1 was sensitively designed it could contribute to the character of Preston. | |
| 94 | EH1 | | The basis for Preston being designated a Category A village is unclear, if not unreasonable. | No change | This categorisation is made in the Local Plan. | |
| 94 | EH3 | | The suggestion in 5.1 to use the PR1 site will obviously reduce the amount of green space within the village. It seems strange that this area is missing from the list on p59. | No change | As the site is allocated for development in the Local Plan, it cannot also be protected as a green space. | |
| 94 | EH9 | | This is important - the sewage system is antiquated and over-burdened. New developments must not piggy-back on this infrastructure, but deliver additional capacity. This must be explicitly incorporated in the Plan. | Policy change | Amend EH9. Add in last sentence after "development", "have the potential to". This now implies, before and not after it happens. | ✓ |
| 94 | TC1 | | The goal of having two off-road parking spaces per house is hard to deliver without eating up more green spaces. | No change | The design of new residential development should incorporate sufficient parking space to avoid parking on-road. | |
| 94 | TC2 | | The dependency on copper lines to deliver broadband around the village would be exacerbated by the development envisaged in PR1, since these new houses would key into the line from the box before pre-existing houses further round Chequers Lane. Thus, significant investment in new infrastructure should be written into any plan for the development of PR1 | No change | The policy includes "without any adverse impact". | |
| 95 | | 5.1 | In reference to the following sentence The community understands the need to accommodate housing growth over the next 13 years and accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011- 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane. The wording of the sentence must be corrected. Multiple members of the community do not understand or accept the proposed Templars lane site. | Para change | Para 5.1 will be changed in response to this - see change against ID93 para 5.1 | ✓ |
| 96 | | 5.1 | My self and multiple other objected to the development of the Templars lane site It is totally unacceptable and an misrepresentation for the following sentence to be used in the plan. "The community understands the need to accommodate housing growth over the next 13 years and accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011- 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane." | Para change | Para 5.1 will be changed in response to this - see change against ID93 para 5.1 | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|-----|--------|-----------|---|---------------|--|----------|
| 97 | | 5.1 | In reference to -The community understands the need to accommodate housing growth over the next 13 years and accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011- 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane. This statement is false. Many people disagree with further construction on the field adjacent to Templars lane. The plan should mention the views of others in the community, who do not wish to see further houses on the site, and wish development on other sites. | Para change | Para 5.1 will be changed in response to this - see change against ID93 para 5.1 | ✓ |
| 98 | | 5.1 | The community understands the need to accommodate housing growth over the next 13 years and accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011- 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane. Since the NHDC local plan was first proposed in 2011, I and many other local residents have been against this proposal of the Templars lane site development. The statement above contradicts mine and many others beliefs as it states "the community" which suggest all members of our local community accepts and understands this proposal. I believe a substantial number of my fellow residents of Preston are part of our local community and we are against this motion, therefore this statement is clearly false I would like to see the statement revised to better reflect the true opinion of our local community as a whole | Para change | Para 5.1 will be changed in response to this - see change against ID93 para 5.1 | ✓ |
| 99 | HD1 | | Policy HD1 "Small-scale proposals of less than five homes are preferred for any development at any one time up to 2031" - I cannot support this. There is a massive housing shortage for young and increasingly middle aged people. I cannot support a policy which appears to be trying to confine our Parish to doing close to the minimum it can get away with to help alleviate this housing shortage, by stretching out our commitment to the housing target of the Local Plan for as long as possible. | Policy change | See comment on ID NH which covers this point. Policy amended with agreement of NHDC | ✓ |
| 101 | | Journey | 2.13 Evidence base - it is somewhat surprising that The Preston Trust (mentioned only once in the plan in section 3.19) is not listed as being consulted in 2.13 or anywhere else in the document. Considering 3.19 suggests "has amongst its aims the preservation of features of historic or public interest, and the promotion of high standards of planning and architecture, in the parish." I would expect to see either a statement from them or some acknowledgement that they have helped or supported somewhere in this document. | No change | The Preston Trust is listed as a consultee in Appendix 18 of the Consultation Statement. | |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|-----|--------|-------------|--|------------------------|--|----------|
| 101 | | Parish | Some of this, whilst very interesting is rather drawn out and sometimes irrelevant e.g. 'winds of Siberia' - section 3.6 and so would read better if edited for brevity. Some historical points are unnecessary within a planning document. Though, I am surprised that the area historically that was known as The Wilderness on the north western part of the village (around the junction of Butchers Lane/Charlton Road/Chequers Lane) where now stands a cottage with the same name doesn't get a mention (see History of Preston website http://www.prestonherts.co.uk/ !:) Section 3.21 There are 13 listed houses and 21 cottages (listed?) mentioned here = 34 total. I am guessing these are the ones in the conservation area? But this section goes on to others not in the conservation area. However, Section 3.20 suggest 33 in conservation area. So section 3.21 may need some adjustment to be clear. | Para change | A little poetic licence is ok and this is drawn from the published history of Preston. However, the number of listed buildings does need to be checked and properly quoted. This has been done and correct figures appear in both Plan and Appendix. | ✓ |
| 101 | | Objective | 5.1 - I do not support the statement that 'The Community.....accepts the development target proposed in the emerging NHDC Local Plan 2011- 2031 of 21 units on land off Templars Lane.' I do not recall at any time during the survey or at any meetings was I asked to specifically accept the 21 units on land off Templars Lane (PR1 site). Many objections were made to NHDC at the last consultation in November 2016. The statement in the Neighbourhood Plan is not backed by any evidence you have requested from the community. The numbers in the section are confusing - are you suggesting a further 38 houses are to be built by 2031? Or, if a total of 17 have been built so far are you suggesting a further 21? If so, where did the estimate for 38 appear from? This is the first I've heard of it. Obj H6 - states every house should have a garden - this is contradicted elsewhere on two occasions - Policy HD7 & 9.3 where more than 5 should have a garden OR less than five don't need a garden....which is it? Obj H7 & associated policies (HD8) later - I think it is naïve to think that the lanes which help towards the rural character of our village will be maintained as such if larger housing developments (5 then 5 again say on PR1) are the aim here...it is very likely that drainage and increased transport (T4) will mean that our lanes are lost - unless you state which lanes should not change in character in the document. Could this include characteristics of the Lanes specifically? | Policy and Para change | Para 5.1 accommodates the site allocation in the Local Plan. HD7 to be amended to include examples where a private garden may not be necessary. Amend Para 9.3 last sentence. Delete "of five or more homes" and add in brackets after gardens "(this question was asked in the survey in relation to 5 or more houses in error. It is assumed that the same number of respondents would have indicated the need for a all homes to have a garden without reference to 5 or more houses.) The character of the lanes is now included in policy HD10 | ✓ |
| | | | | | | |
| 101 | | 8.1 to 8.10 | section 8.2 - The PR1 site is also enjoyed by many on a daily basis. Dog walkers and children play safely there. section 8.6 - tennis courts and an area where children can play safely and in a way not to upset cricketers or their ground would be welcomed. | No change | Comments on site PR1 have been dealt with in the reply to other comments. The lack of safe play areas was not substantiated in the survey. | |
| 101 | | 9.1 to 9.17 | 9.3 & 9.11 contradict earlier statements about gardens | Policy change | This comment has been dealt with under ID 101 Objective | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|-----|--------|-----------|--|---------------|--|----------|
| 101 | HD1 | | yes it seems you suggest an incremental rise and so less than 5 houses and then another less than 5 houses on the same site later.... | No change | The policy relates to a preference for small scale proposals at any one time. | |
| 101 | EH2 | | hitchwood trail not in parish....should mention well used footpath between butchers lane and chequers lane >20 villagers use daily | No change | The reference is to the path to get to the Hitch Wood Nature Trail | |
| 101 | | Appendix | C.1.5 green spaces - overgrown meadow mentioned but should mention PR1 site....it is used all the time by the community! | No change | Comments on site PR1 have been dealt with in the reply to other comments. | ✓ |
| AW | EH9 | | National Planning Policy and the related guidance requires that development is directed where the risk of flooding is lowest (from all sources). It is therefore proposed that Policy EH9 is amended as follows: 'All development should avoid areas at the highest risk of flooding from all sources, but where development is necessary, it should be demonstrated that these risks can be adequately managed.' | Policy change | Suggested wording to be incorporated in to revised policy HD8 | ✓ |
| AW | HD8 | | The purpose of Policy HD8 as outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan is to address the risk of both sewer and surface water flooding from new development. We would recommend that the wording of Policy HD8 should be amended to distinguish between surface water and foul drainage and to emphasise that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) should be employed for surface water disposal unless it can be shown to be technically unfeasible. It is therefore proposed that Policy HD8 is amended as follows: All new developments should take advantage of modern sustainable drainage methods systems (SuDs) to avoid creating or contributing to localised surface water flooding and should ensure that suitable and sufficient foul sewage disposal provisions will be available before any property is occupied. | Policy change | Suggested wording to be incorporated in to revised policy HD8 | ✓ |
| TW | HD8 | | With regard to surface water drainage development proposals should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and follow the SuDS hierarchy as set out in Policy NE8 of the emerging North Hertfordshire Local Plan and summarised below. 1. store rainwater for later use 2. use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas 3. attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release 4. attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release 5. discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse 6. discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain 7. discharge rainwater to the foul water sewer. | Policy change | Incorporate wording on greenfield run-off rates and SuDS hierarchy in revised policy HD8. Include the list of options for reducing run-off in the text of paragraph 9.16. | ✓ |
| NH | CR1 | | CR1, CR2 and CR3. These policies do not need to be included in the neighbourhood plan. The Community Rights to Bid, Build and Right to Reclaim Land are all subject to processes outside the planning system and as such these policies cannot be used in the determination of planning applications. | Policy change | Delete policies CR1 - CR3 text to become sub-paragraphs of 6.8. Include the option of listing requests to NHDC in future for Assets of Community Value. Check ownership of the village hall. | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|---|---------------|---|----------|
| NH | QL1 | | Policy is aspirational and it is suggested that the detailed wording of these policies should be re-considered to enable them to be used effectively when determining planning applications. | Policy change | Development proposals must maintain, improve, or make suitable alternative provision for existing facilities or premises for cultural, leisure and sport. | ✓ |
| NH | QL2 | | Policy is aspirational and it is suggested that the detailed wording of these policies should be re-considered to enable them to be used effectively when determining planning applications. | Policy change | Development proposals should demonstrate that they will have no net adverse effect on air or water quality and they should design out crime. See also Policies EH3, EH6 and EH10-12. | ✓ |
| NH | QL3 | | Policy is aspirational and it is suggested that the detailed wording of these policies should be re-considered to enable them to be used effectively when determining planning applications. | Policy change | The architecture of and landscaping schemes in all new developments should preserve and where possible enhance heritage assets and historic features, thereby promoting community identity and preserving local distinctiveness. The addition of supplementary guidance on small development sites and historic buildings will be added to the Project List see ID70. | ✓ |
| NH | HD1 | | This policy appears to be contrary to the proposals in the emerging Local Plan, where a site has been allocated for 21 dwellings. Or is it the intention of the policy to restrict all additional future development to small scale proposals of five or fewer dwellings, unless demonstrated as an exception site? | No change | Discuss with NH. The policy would allow a phased development of PR1 and is not prescriptive only 'preferring' small-scale proposals appropriate to the size of the village. Policy amended | ✓ |
| NH | HD4 | | The emerging Local Plan includes an affordable housing policy which includes thresholds for the provision of affordable housing. There is no provision for development sites of below 11 dwellings to make provision for any affordable housing. If the neighbourhood plan includes a policy to restrict development to small sites (Policy HD1), below the affordable housing threshold it is difficult to see how affordable housing can be provided in the village (such as for first time buyers, Policy HD3), except through the development of an exception site. | Policy change | Addition to policy following discussion with NHDC, including reference to Local Plan which indicates percentages of affordable housing for size of development. | ✓ |
| NH | HD7 | | Whilst we understand the aims of this policy, should it be clarified to set out whether a shared garden would be appropriate in some circumstances, for example in a development scheme for elderly people? | Policy change | Add to end of policy "In certain circumstances a shared garden might be appropriate, for example in a development scheme for elderly people." | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|-----------|--|-----------------------|--|----------|
| NH | HD9 | | Currently, planning applications for extensions which are within a metre of a property boundary can be approved but it is unclear from the policy as it is currently worded whether it is intended that residential extensions at ground floor level should be at least 1m away from the boundary of the property. In the emerging Local Plan, Policy D2: House extensions, replacement dwellings and outbuildings, does give a distance for side extensions at first floor level adjoining a residential plot should be at of 1m from the boundary. In preparing the next version of the neighbourhood plan, it might be beneficial for the Steering Group to discuss this further with the District Council. | Policy change | After safeguarded insert ". Side extensions at first floor level or above adjoining a residential plot to the side must be at least one metre away from the boundary to ensure there is no adverse impact on the character of the street scene. " | ✓ |
| NH | HD11 | | The District Council does try and manage construction traffic and activity through development management decisions, by way of condition, but normally only for developments in excess of 10 dwellings. Is it intended that the policy applies to all development? In preparing the next version of the neighbourhood plan, it might be beneficial for the Steering Group to discuss this further with the District Council. | Policy change | First sentence of the policy to read "A Construction Management Plan, at the appropriate level of detail for the size of the development should be produced for all new homes...." | ✓ |
| NH | EH3 | | Would it be appropriate to include a map of the green infrastructure to which this policy applies? As it stands, the policy is not clear and would be difficult to use in determining planning applications. It would be possible for the neighbourhood plan to designate local green spaces which would help to demonstrate which areas of open space are particularly important to the community. Local green spaces could also include the significant ponds mentioned in Policy EH10. If the Steering Group needs any assistance with preparing a map, we would be pleased to discuss this. | Append and Map change | Add significant ponds to the inventory of important green spaces in Appendix C Include a map of important green spaces to include ponds and verges. | ✓ |
| NH | EH4 | | Could the policy be clarified to establish what is meant by a "clear visual break"? Given that there is some distance between Preston and the settlements listed in the policy it would be difficult to assess whether a development would encroach on a "clear visual break". | No change | Clarification could be by means of a minimum distance between the edge of the settlements? In Green Belt policy the term used is "preventing the merging of". Para 10.13 should also be amended to reflect a policy change. To be discussed with NHDC. | ✓ |
| NH | EH7 | | The last sentence of the policy should be deleted from the policy and included in the supporting text. | Policy change | Move the last sentence of the policy to the end of the first sentence ", for example, the wall and gate....." | ✓ |
| NH | EH9 | | Could policies HD8 and EH9 be combined into a single policy which encompasses flood risk and drainage provisions? | Policy change | EH9 would sit better in the Housing section. Objective H7 and E6 should also be combined. The Environment section should be rearranged to match Objectives with Policies. | ✓ |

| ID | Policy | Paragraph | Comment | Action | Change Required | Included |
|----|--------|---------------------|---|---------------|---|----------|
| NH | TC1 | | Following the examination hearing sessions on the Local Plan, consideration is being given to a proposed modification to the residential parking standards, which includes the provision of a minimum of 3 parking spaces for 4+ bedrooms. The Steering Group may wish to review criteria 'c)' accordingly. | Policy change | Amend Policy TC1 and HD9 to incorporate the new wording re 4+ bedroom homes. | ✓ |
| NH | | Implementation Plan | It is important to note that whilst the District Council does monitor all planning applications this is undertaken with a view to collecting data about the type and locations of development that is taking place across the District. The Council welcomes the acknowledgment that the Parish Council will be monitoring the effectiveness of the neighbourhood plan. | No change | Comment noted. | ✓ |
| HE | | | General advice given (see separate letter) but includes non-listed heritage assets and Historic Parks and Gardens. | Project list | The identification of non-listed heritage assets should be added to the Project List. Add list as an Appendix when the plan is reviewed - or now if time allows. Policy EH7 will be amended to include non-listed assets. Add reference to proposals for the conservation management of historic gardens being welcomed. | ✓ |
| JV | | 12.1 | Include reference to S106 and the Project List | Para change | Include reference to S106 and the Project List | ✓ |
| KH | | Appendix | Include lists and maps of undesignated buildings and heritage assets. See HE comment above | | Include lists and maps of undesignated buildings and heritage assets in Appendix | ✓ |

Appendix 26 - June 2018 newsletter for Regulation 16 Consultation

PRESTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: REGULATION 16

The Regulation 16 Consultation is now available on the NHDC website:

www.north-herts.gov.uk/approved-neighbourhood-areas-preston. The closing date is Thursday 5 July.

The Neighbourhood Plan and associated documents are on the Preston Neighbourhood Plan website:

www.preston-np.org.uk/your-say/

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|--|-------------------|---|----------|
| NHDC | QL1 | | It is not clear from the policy wording which type of development proposals would be subject to this policy and therefore should maintain, improve or make suitable alternative provision for existing facilities or premises for education, cultural, leisure and sport. | Policy change | Policy amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | QL2 | | It is not clear how a development proposal can demonstrate that there will be no net effect on air or water quality. What is the justification for “no” effect?” | Policy change | Policy amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | AF2 | | The policy broadly accords with the Policy HC1: Community facilities in the Submission version of the Local Plan. However, the last sentence in the policy is unclear as to what “part” of an existing dwelling would be acceptable to change from a dwelling to a community facility | Policy change | Policy amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | AF3 | | In most circumstances, “normal” home working arrangements do not need a planning application for a change of use as the character of the dwelling is not affected. An application is only required where there might be changes in how a property is used, for example if there are employees, additional traffic movements or the installation of equipment. | Policy change | Policy amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | | 9.3 | The preference expressed is for homes to have two bedrooms (58%) and three bedrooms (63%) but this is confusing as these total over 100%. Were residents able to choose more than one category? Are the Neighbourhood Planning Group satisfied that this figure represents a housing need rather than a housing preference from respondents? | Paragraph amended | Paragraph 9.3 and others in this section amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | | 9.5 | The percentage figures given in paragraph 9.5 are confusing. The figures seem to suggest that residents want new homes for families (62%), locals (60%) and first time buyers (60%). Does this mean that respondents were able to choose more than one category and that all three groups are a priority for the parish? It would be interesting to know what groups the other 40% of respondents think should be housed? Likewise a similar number of residents want owner occupied tenure (69%) and affordable tenures (66% - 36% rented and 30% shared ownership?) so is it correct that market and affordable tenures are equally as important? | Paragraph amended | Paragraph 9.5 and others in this section amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|--|----------------|---|----------|
| NHDC | HD1 | | <p>The emerging Local Plan allocates sites across the District to meet local housing needs in the period up to 2031. Preston has been defined as a Category A settlement where development will be allowed within the settlement boundary and a site for 21 dwellings has been allocated. The neighbourhood plan policy conflicts with the emerging Local Plan policy.</p> <p>The preference for smaller developments means that it is unlikely that any affordable housing will be delivered unless this happens on an exception site basis, as there is no affordable housing requirement on sites with a threshold of fewer than 11 dwellings. The Council does not consider that it would be viable to deliver the 21 dwellings on the allocated site in phases of 5 dwellings as two homes in each phase would need to be affordable to ensure the 7 affordable dwellings required in the emerging Local Plan. This is not only at odds with the emerging Local Plan but also at odds with the Neighbourhood Plan requirements, as indicated above.</p> <p>Whilst the concerns set out in paragraph 9.11 are acknowledged, there are policies in the emerging Local Plan which will ensure appropriate densities in rural locations to ensure distinctiveness of rural settings are preserved and compliment village character, rather than detract from it.</p> <p>It would also be useful in HD1 to make reference to parish level housing needs surveys/ assessments as a basis for justification of need for additional dwellings. As worded, this is not a policy which can be used in determining planning applications as the wording only suggests a preference for small scale proposals and appears to be contrary to the emerging Local Plan where a site for 21 dwellings has been allocated.</p> | Policy change | Policy amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | HD2 | | There is some duplication with Policy EH8 : Access to the Countryside. Both policies seek to maintain the existing rights of way network and incorporate new footpaths into that network. | Policy amended | Policy amended and HD2 now incorporates EH8, one policy instead of two. | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|---|----------------|--|----------|
| NHDC | HD3 | | Although the percentage figures in the evidence are confusing, the evidence does suggest that there is a greater requirement for two and three bed homes. The Council will rely on evidence from the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), parish level housing need surveys/assessments and local knowledge (for example from the common housing register), in addition to any adopted NP to inform the number, type and tenure of any affordable housing provision. It is very rare to get the provision of bungalows, particularly on smaller schemes, as costs are so much greater. Where bungalows in rural areas have been delivered, it has generally been on a 100% affordable housing scheme. | Policy amended | Policy amended following discussion with NHDC | Yes |
| NHDC | HD4 | | To ensure that any affordable homes are let/ sold to applicants with a local connection to the parish a S106/ legal agreement will require that homes are offered to applicants with a local connection (live, work, immediate family connection) to the parish of Preston in the first instance. If there isn't anyone that meets the criteria then the following cascade will apply: adjoining parishes (which will be named in the S106); any other rural parish in NHDC district and then NHDC district generally. Obviously, there is no such control over market housing. | Policy amended | Policy amended to include Section 106 criteria for affordable homes. | Yes |
| NHDC | HD6 | | The advice given by the Council is that all affordable housing dwellings should meet Homes England Design and Quality standards, some of which are in the current Planning Obligations SPD. It is usual for affordable housing dwellings to have adequate storage facilities for refuse receptacles and bicycles. In the case of storage for mobility scooters the type of accommodation may dictate if appropriate/ adequate storage is provided. | No change | This policy is for all development not just affordable housing, therefore this comment doesn't justify a policy change | No |
| HCC | HD6 | | HCC would support the inclusion of the following: "provide a minimum of 1 secure, covered and high quality cycle parking space per new residential unit to ensure encourage use of sustainable modes of travel." | Policy amended | This point added to policy HD6 | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|---|---------------|--|----------|
| NHDC | HD7 | | It is a requirement for family houses to have private gardens; it is not always achievable for flats. Previously a registered provider has delivered 4 x 1 bedroom flats on a rural scheme with the outside appearance of a terrace of dwelling houses and each flat had access to their own private garden. Is it the intention of the policy, as currently worded to prevent development which would meet an identified local housing need if the requirement for a garden could not be met? | No change | Comment noted. Questionnaire results indicate that 76% of residents believe that all houses should have a garden, para 9.5 | No |
| NHDC | HD8 | | Policies in the Submission version of the Local Plan set out the requirements for reducing flood risk when considering development proposals and for the inclusion of sustainable drainage solutions when granting planning permission. The policy does not add any further requirements to the measures already addressed by policies in the Local Plan. | No change | Comment noted, but policy to remain as this is an emotive issue in Preston. | No |
| NHDC | HD9 | | Detailed comments about the car parking standards referenced in this policy are given in the response to Policy TC1. | | See policy TC1 below | |
| NHDC | HD10 | | The wording in the policy, "New access arrangements should be safe, not negatively impact on the"contradicts the wording in the NPPF which states that "....Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." (Para. 32) Maintenance responsibilities would generally be with individual property owners and management companies which may not be possible to identify at the application stage. | Policy change | Policy amended to reflect these comments. | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|---|---------------|--|----------|
| NHDC | HD11 | | <p>In its response to the Regulation 14 consultation draft of the neighbourhood plan, the Council stated that it does try and manage construction traffic and activity through development management decisions, by way of condition but normally for schemes in excess of 10 dwellings. Whilst there are no objections in principle to the policy, it is suggested that the wording is amended as set out below:</p> <p>Construction Management</p> <p>A Construction Management Plan, at the appropriate level of detail for the size of the development, should be (delete: produced) requested for all new homes and other new developments (with the exception of householder development), to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the amenities of existing residents are protected the character of the narrow lanes in the village are protected and to avoid damage to those lanes and their verges a means of access for construction vehicles is agreed. <p>(Delete: prior to the grant of planning permission. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Management Plan.)</p> <p>Developers will be encouraged to comply with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. (http://www.ccscheme.org.uk)</p> | Policy change | Policy amended to reflect these comments | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|--|----------------|--|----------|
| NHDC | EH1 | | <p>As written, this policy has been drafted in accordance with Policies SP2: Settlement Hierarchy and CGB2: Exception sites in rural areas in the emerging Local Plan. However, these policies and the extent of the proposed green belt were discussed extensively at the Local Plan Examination and could be subject to Proposed Modifications and may not be confirmed in the Inspector's final report when that is issued.</p> <p>Until the Inspector has issued his report for the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 – 2031, the proposed green belt designation will not be confirmed and therefore this policy is premature in using that proposed classification for use in determining planning applications.</p> <p>In addition, the policy wording "will have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances" goes beyond the requirements of the NPPF. Paragraphs 87 – 89 set out that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances and the types of development which are not inappropriate in the Green Belt.</p> | Policy change | Following discussion with NHDC, this policy and policy EH2 have been revised into one policy: EH1: Village Boundary, Rural Character and Setting. The numbering of subsequent policies has been amended accordingly. | Yes |
| NHDC | EH2 | | This policy has been discussed with the Preston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the Council remains unconvinced how the policy can be used in determining planning applications | Policy change | See above | Yes |
| NHDC | EH3 | | The last sentence of the policy should be deleted as these are illustrative and all designated heritage assets are listed in Appendix C – Built Environment | Policy amended | Comment noted. Sentence removed from policy. | Yes |
| HCC | EH3 | | <p>HCC commends this recognition that both known and currently unknown buried heritage assets or archaeological interest should be considered during development. However, we therefore recommend that Policy EH3: Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets should include specific mention of below-ground heritage assets with regard to designated and non-designated heritage assets. We also recommend that the text is augmented to reflect NPPF paragraph 128:</p> <p>"... Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation."</p> | Policy amended | Comment noted and recommendation added to policy. | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|---|------------------------------|---|----------|
| NHDC | EH4 | | It is unclear from the policy as it is currently worded what is considered to be green infrastructure. The policy implies that this is applicable to all types of green space but the Neighbourhood Plan would be clearer if the sites to which the policy applies to were identified. This could be achieved by designating local green spaces in the Neighbourhood Plan. The policy will be applied if there is any detrimental impact on green infrastructure but how will this be assessed? It is not clear why the four examples listed are of particular importance. These should be deleted from the policy. | Policy change and new policy | Policy amended and local green spaces will be designated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph added to text and new Policy: EH5: Local Green Spaces added. | |
| NHDC | EH5 | | There is some overlap between this policy and policies EH9, EH10 and EH11. Collectively, it is considered that these policies do not add any further requirement to the measures already addressed by policies in the Local Plan. It is also worth noting that the policies in the Local Plan were subject to scrutiny through the Local Plan Examination and may still be subject to modifications. | Policy change | Policies EH5, EH9, EH10 and EH11 have been replaced by one policy: a new EH7 | Yes |
| NHDC | EH6 | | There are areas of potential contradictions between this and other policies in the neighbourhood plan, for example a development might increase traffic levels, designing out crime may increase street lighting but create a safe environment for walking. | No change | These comments are noted but referring to NPPF Para 180, the policy is justified and development should mitigate against any adverse effects on the quality of life of the community. | |
| NHDC | EH7 | | As worded, the policy requires any development proposal to include an assessment of the impact on key views and vistas, which would include single storey extensions. The policy should be amended to exclude minor household applications. | Policy change | Policy amended | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|----------------|------|--|---------------|---|----------|
| HCC | EH7 | | The identification of important local views and vistas is fully supported. It is advised that where development proposals are likely to have an impact upon visual amenity, the NP should require developers to produce a landscape and visual impact assessment in line with good practice guidance GLVIA3). | Policy change | Addition to policy, following this recommendation. | Yes |
| NHDC | EH8 | | There is some duplication with Policy HD2 : Pedestrian Links and Rights of Way. Both policies seek to maintain the existing rights of way network and incorporate new footpaths into that network and could be combined into one policy in the neighbourhood plan. It is not clear why some footpaths have been included as examples, these should be deleted from the policy. | | See policy HD2 above | |
| NHDC | EH9 | | There is some overlap between this policy and policies EH9, EH10 and EH11. Collectively, it is considered that these policies do not add any further requirement to the measures already addressed by policies in the Local Plan. It is also worth noting that the policies in the Local Plan were subject to scrutiny through the Local Plan Examination and may still be subject to modifications. | Policy change | Policies EH5,EH9, EH10 and EH11 have been replaced by one policy: a new EH7 | Yes |
| HCC | EH 5,9, 10, 11 | | <p>There is concern that some of the policy wording is confusing and repetitive. Policy wording should be succinct and easily understood by the audience it is intended for, and the number of policies relevant to any key issue should be minimised as far as possible, in order that users can identify relevant policies quickly and easily.</p> <p>For example Policy EH5: Protecting and Enhancing the Local Environment and Policy EH9: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment are worded the same with the exception of the additional reference to Sites of Specific Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites under EH5. There is then a further separate policy for Wildlife Sites (Policy EH10) and another policy for Biodiversity (EH11).</p> | As above | As above | yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|------|--|---------------|--|----------|
| HCC | | | <p>The reference to important local spaces within the village is fully supported. Care should be taken to ensure that the appropriate hooks can be made within the NP to the NPPF to ensure their protection. There is no reference to any important landscape features, such as trees and hedgerows, which can be identified within NPs.</p> <p>NPPF Chapter 11 refers to the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes. There is an emerging industry approach to assessing landscape value and this is set out in the GLVIA, which states the following:</p> <p>Where proposals affect trees, tree surveys, impact assessments, and method statements in line with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations' should be required. Where the loss of trees is unavoidable, policies can require that for every tree lost, two new replacement trees should be provided.</p> <p>Countryside hedgerows should be protected in line with the Hedgerow Regulations (1997).</p> | New policy | These comments have been noted and a new policy EH8: Hedgerows, Trees and Verges has been added to the Neighbourhood Plan. | Yes |
| NHDC | EH10 | | There is some overlap between this policy and policies EH9, EH10 and EH11. Collectively, it is considered that these policies do not add any further requirement to the measures already addressed by policies in the Local Plan. It is also worth noting that the policies in the Local Plan were subject to scrutiny through the Local Plan Examination and may still be subject to modifications. | Policy change | Policies EH5, EH9, EH10 and EH11 have been replaced by one policy: a new EH7 | Yes |
| NHDC | EH11 | | There is some overlap between this policy and policies EH9, EH10 and EH11. Collectively, it is considered that these policies do not add any further requirement to the measures already addressed by policies in the Local Plan. It is also worth noting that the policies in the Local Plan were subject to scrutiny through the Local Plan Examination and may still be subject to modifications | Policy change | Policies EH5, EH9, EH10 and EH11 have been replaced by one policy: a new EH7 | Yes |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|------|--------|----------------------|--|---------------------|---|----------|
| NHDC | TC1 | | <p>The parking standards set out Policy TC1(c) requires additional car parking provision for 4+ bedroom residential units. There is however, no justification for these standards in the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any evidence to support the increased standards, for example, the Pirton Neighbourhood Plan was able to demonstrate higher levels of car ownership within the village. The Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan sets out a minimum standard for car parking provision of 2 spaces per dwelling. Those standards were discussed at the Local Plan Examination and at the time this version of the Neighbourhood Plan was being prepared, there was some discussion that these standards would be amended, as set out in the Council's response to the Regulation 14 consultation document. However, the car parking standards may still be subject to modification and without sufficient evidence to justify the enhanced standards it might be difficult for the Council to use these in determining planning applications for development schemes in the Parish.</p> | Text amended | The Policy remains the same but paragraph 11.4 has been amended to include justification for the policy. There is high levels of car ownership in Preston, in some cases 3 cars for 2 adults and a poor bus service | Yes |
| HR | | Appendix C, p68 | <p>In Appendix C - the list of ponds and streams - the pond at TL183246 is described as "possibly old slurry pit". This is false as it was dug as a reservoir when the Estate water supply using the header tank in the adjoining barn was constructed in the early years of the 20th Century on the site of the former Home Farm buildings.</p> <p>In the list of Green Spaces (item 6) the overgrown meadow off Back Lane is listed in the text but is not shown on the map as would be logical.</p> | Text amended | Appendix amended to take account of these points | Yes |
| HR | | Appendix C p 87 & 88 | It is illogical for policy HERC2 not to use the same qualification of the Biodiversity Impact Calculator as in policy HERC1. | No change to policy | Policy provided by HERC therefore suggested change not justified. | NO |

Consultation Statement

| ID | Policy | Para | Comment | Action | Change required | Included |
|----|--------|--------------------|---|--|--|----------|
| HR | | Appendix D, p91 | Recent research by the Royal Horticultural Society has shown that mixes are more valuable than single species. Accordingly, policy HERC10 should be amended to read "an appropriate mix of native species". | No change to policy. Note added after policy. | This note to be added after policy HERC 10: We are informed that recent research by the Royal Horticultural Society has shown that mixes are more valuable than single species and accordingly advice to Preston Parish Council is that an appropriate mix of native species should be used. | Yes |