

Name		Geoff Platts
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.		Consultee – Environment Agency
Rep 1		
Document		Submission plan
Page		24
Policy/Paragraph		H2
Support this policy/part of the plan		
Comment	I am pleased to note that all allocated sites are in the areas of lowest flood risk.	
Suggested Change	N/A	
Rep 2		
Document		Submission plan
Page		40/41
Policy/Paragraph		H7
Support this policy/part of the plan		
Comment	I am supportive in particular of points m & n of this Policy. Water efficiency measures are often overlooked and conservation of water particularly in respect of future climate change is very important. Likewise climate change and a risk of shorter duration periods of high intensity rainfall has the potential to cause localised flooding if appropriate infrastructure is not in place.	
Suggested Change	N/A	
Rep 3		
Document		Submission plan
Page		57
Policy/Paragraph		ENV4
Support this policy/part of the plan		
Comment	N/A	
Suggested Change	N/A	
Rep 4		
Document		Submission plan
Page		62
Policy/Paragraph		ENV7
Support this policy/part of the plan		
Comment	N/A	
Suggested Change	N/A	
Rep 5		
Document		Submission plan
Page		66
Policy/Paragraph		ENV9
Support this policy/part of the plan		
Comment	N/A	
Suggested Change	N/A	
Rep 6		
Document		Submission plan
Page		40/41

Policy/Paragraph	H7
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	N/A
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Moira Hart</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	23
Policy/Paragraph	H1
Neither support nor object to this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I agree that using the HEDNA figures is the preferred option for the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan and support that decision. However, I still have concerns about the number proposed, given the already existing pressure on the infrastructure in the villages, especially in Long Clawson.
Suggested Change	The housing provision should be phased and investment and improvement in infrastructure and services made to accommodate growth.
<u>Rep 2</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	24
Policy/Paragraph	H2
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	As a Long Clawson resident I only feel qualified to comment on the LC site allocations and am in favour of the sites proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Page 31 - I am fully supportive of the decision to exclude LONG 2 The Mungee (Back Lane) due to its location / access and proximity to the village's heritage assets and this is in line with its exclusion from the Melton Local Plan. Page 31 - For the same reasons I am fully supportive that the Neighbourhood Plan has excluded LONG 4 - development on this site would impact significantly on the village's heritage assets as it is located closer to them than LONG 2. It would also impact upon the landscape and visual corridor as development would rise up the slope and dominate the skyline. There are also known flood risks downstream which would be exacerbated by development on this site.
Suggested Change	Happy to run with it as it is but at planning stage there needs to be more pressure put on to develop some bungalows.
<u>Rep 3</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	40
Policy/Paragraph	H7
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I agree with the ethos in this policy - In a village situation any urban style developments should be and must be opposed. I agree that "the quality of design of new buildings and their layout should positively add to the historical character of the villages". However all suggested proposals seen for developments in the villages are tending toward urban style housing estates.

Suggested Change	N/A
Rep 4	
Document	Submission plan
Page	82
Policy/Paragraph	T3
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>As a horse rider and cyclist I very much support their part of the Policy c) improve and extend the public rights of way and cycle/bridle routes between the villages of Harby, Hose and Long Clawson and linking with the Grantham Canal, to create a circular route around the Parish</p> <p>Riding (horse and bike) in the Vale used to be a pleasure but with increased traffic speeding on the rural roads and increases in HGV's you take your life into your hands when venturing out. The provision should be suitable for both horse riders and cyclists</p>
Suggested Change	N/A
Rep 5	
Document	Submission plan
Page	68
Policy/Paragraph	DC1
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	Support this policy
Suggested Change	would like to include the provision of a circular bridleway / cycle route as suggested in Policy T3
Rep 6	
Document	Submission plan
Page	40/41
Policy/Paragraph	H7
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	N/A
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Barbara Cooper</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
Rep 1	
Document	Submission plan
Page	21-40
Policy/Paragraph	Housing
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	The document sets out clearly the areas within the parish which the residents consider suitable for future housing development. These sites should be ample to provide the parish's contribution the Melton Borough's housing needs for the

	next few years. As a resident of Long Clawson I like the way the sites for the village are situated in such a position as to accentuate the "long" character of the village and also to minimise the traffic through the already congested centre of the village. I agree that future development should be designed sensitively to fit in with the character of the villages .
Suggested Change	N/A
Rep 2	
Document	Submission plan
Page	42-70
Policy/Paragraph	Environment
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I very much appreciate the hard work that has gone into mapping the sensitive environmental areas of the parish; the historical environment, biodiversity and natural landscape and the areas which are considered to be important to the residents of the three villages, whether it be a playing field, a public footpath or a much loved view or vista. I think this document will serve the parish well as an inventory of what exists in the environment of the parish in 2016-17..
Suggested Change	Happy to run with it as it is but at planning stage there needs to be more pressure put on to develop some bungalows.
Rep 3	
Document	Submission plan
Page	77-78
Policy/Paragraph	Transport
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I agree that the plan has flagged up the inadequate nature of public transport in the borough. Most residents rely on cars to get anywhere. As a non-driver I have first hand experience on the difficulties of using public transport, for instance to travel from Long Clawson to Nottingham by bus requires a trip by car from the village to the nearest bus stop in Nether Broughton. There is no evening bus service through the villages to Melton and no public transport at all on Sundays. It is laughable to expect residents will use public transport if they have access to a car.
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Roger Adams</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
Rep 1	
Document	Submission plan
Page	Document in its entirety
Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	N/A
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Janice Lumb</u>
Resident, Stakeholder,	Resident

Consultee.	
Rep 1	
Document	Submission plan
Page	Document in its entirety
Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	As residents of the village we feel that this plan wholeheartedly represents appropriate details for the sustainability of these Leicestershire villages.
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Elizabeth Rhodes obo Margaret Swain</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Agent
Rep 1	
Document	Policy Map - Long Clawson
Page	35
Policy/Paragraph	
Object to this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	On behalf of my client I object to the NP based on the fact that it fails provide sufficient flexibility to accord with Policy SS2 and SS3 of the emerging Local Plan, given that the Limits to Development are drawn so tightly around the settlement. Whilst there are allocated sites, these only seems to allow for large scale development. This is not in keeping with the local character and existing development patterns in the village, and we believe that the plan should allow for smaller developments dispersed around the village.
Suggested Change	Increase the village boundary areas to allow for smaller scale developments spread around the village. Smaller infill developments will have less impact than the larger scale developments concentrated in a couple of sites around the village currently shown on the proposed plan.
<u>Name</u>	<u>Nigel Hodges</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
Rep 1	
Document	Submission plan
Page	Document in its entirety
Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I'm supportive of the plan as submitted.
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Nathan Jones</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident/Landowner "Solely the owner of a freehold residential property (subject to legal charge) that I occupy with my family (and which is not subject to any direct changes from the proposed plan)"
Rep 1	

Document	Submission plan
Page	46
Policy/Paragraph	LGS
Support this policy/part of the plan subject to modifications	
Comment	I support this area of the plan. My only reservation is that the children's play area (in Hose) adjacent to the Church should also (properly?) be designated as a "Local green space". I note that this space is designated as an "important open space" later on in the report.
Suggested Change	The children's play area adjacent to the Church (in Hose) should be designated as "Local Green Space"
Rep 2	
Document	Submission plan
Page	43 & 56
Policy/Paragraph	Important Open Areas (Community Action ENV1)
Support this policy/part of the plan subject to modifications	
Comment	I am unclear as to why the area designated the title "Z094" (on the Hose map) does not join the main Hose-Harby road in the same way that all of the other "important open area" properties do. I would expect that Z094 should follow similar boundaries to Z092 and Z095 along the Long Clawson - Hose - Harby Road
Suggested Change	Z094 should follow similar boundaries to Z092 and Z095 along the Long Clawson - Hose - Harby Road, which would have the effect of increasing the size of Z094
Rep 3	
Document	Submission plan
Page	53
Policy/Paragraph	COMMUNITY ACTION ENV 1
Support this policy/part of the plan subject to modifications	
Comment	The referencing is incorrect between pages 54 and 55 (ref: Hose). The text refers to "Green Lane (bridleway), Hose (Z998)", however, the map reference is "X998". I am also unclear as to whether Z997 meets the definition of "important open area".
Suggested Change	The documentation should be updated to make the cross-referencing accurate. Z997 should be reviewed to ascertain whether it meets the criteria for "important open area"
Rep 4	
Document	Submission plan
Page	
Policy/Paragraph	Areas of Separation
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I note that "ENV3" of the previous plan that was put out to consultation has been removed ("Areas of Separation"). Whilst I had concerns about how the practicalities of allocating sites to ensure areas of separation might be maintained, I strongly support the fact that the villages that constitute out parish should remain separate.
Suggested Change	Re-introduce provisions to ensure that "Areas of Separation" are a fundamental consideration in future planning decisions
Rep 5	
Document	Submission plan
Page	General Comments

Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>Whilst I have submitted some (technical?) comments on ways in which I consider that the Neighbourhood Plan might be improved, those should not detract from the over-riding support that I have for the plan that is being proposed.</p> <p>Please convey my thanks to all of those that have generously and selflessly given up their time to make this Neighbourhood plan a reality</p>
<u>Name</u>	<u>Howard Thomas</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	25
Policy/Paragraph	L
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>After the lengthy meetings & the full consultation of the village on the proposals to planning of the HOS1 & HOS2 it was a unanimous decision to fully back this proposal.</p> <p>This proposal will preserve the integrity & vision of our Neighborhood Plan.</p>
Suggested Change	N/A"
<u>Name</u>	<u>Linda Adams</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	Submission plan in entirety
Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>My comment relates to the Plan as it applies to Long Clawson. I believe that this plan is the result of a very thorough exercise and a huge amount of time and commitment by those involved in its preparation. Given that there was a requirement to accommodate development in Long Clawson, the sites suggested as being acceptable for development (subject to the conditions stated in the Plan) are the ones which impinge least on the individual character and nature of the village which, I understand is one of the aims of the Melton local plan.</p>
Suggested Change	N/A"
<u>Name</u>	<u>Sarah Turner</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan

Page	Submission plan in entirety
Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	N/A
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Robert Hughes obo First Provincial Properties Ltd</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Agent
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan + policies maps
Page	
Policy/Paragraph	H1 - Housing provision
Object to this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>Policy H1 (Housing Provision) sets out a minimum target of 161 new dwellings to be built across the three villages between 2016 and 2036. The draft policy reads as follows:</p> <p>Having regard to dwellings already constructed and granted planning permission, the housing provision for the Parish will be a target of a minimum of 161 new dwellings across the three villages over the period 2016 to 2036, which will be met by the allocation of housing Development Sites in Policy H2. The delivery level from the Development Sites will be increased through the release of Reserve Sites only if a higher residual requirement is identified when the Melton Local Plan is adopted which cannot be met from the Development Sites in Policy H2 or if new requirement and/or a shortfall in delivery of Development Sites is identified via the Plan monitoring and review process which will be completed every 5 years.</p> <p>It is noted that the policy is couched in terms of minimum and not maximum housing provision, which accords with the Government's policies to "boost significantly" the supply of housing and it is also clear from the policy that in circumstances where the minimum number of housing has been delivered, this would not form a reason for preventing additional housing development that may come forward in the plan period.</p> <p>In this respect, it is submitted that Policy H1 is in accord with the Framework.</p> <p>The subsequent part of the policy does not however accord with the Framework insofar as it implies that the amount of housing will only be increased if a higher requirement is either identified in a New Melton Local Plan or via a five-year Plan monitoring process. This policy approach in effect represents a limit to development, a maximum and not (as the policy suggests) a minimum.</p> <p>This approach is clearly contrary to the Government's objectives for boosting significantly the supply of housing.</p>

	<p>In addition, the policy goes on to say that only Reserve Sites will be released for additional development. Such an approach would preclude currently unidentified but perfectly suitable sites from coming forward for housing development during the 20-year lifetime of the DNP.</p> <p>In its current form, the policy is conflicted and fails to achieve sustainable development. This approach is not consistent with the Framework. The DNP is currently unsound on this basis.</p>
Suggested Change	<p>In the light of the above, it is submitted that Policy H1 and H2 should be amended to make the DNP compliant with the Draft Melton Local Plan, sound and legally compliant, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following text in Policy H1 should be omitted: <p>“The delivery level from the Development Sites will be increased through the release of Reserve Sites only if a higher residual requirement is identified when the Melton Local Plan is adopted which cannot be met from the Development Sites in Policy H2 or if new requirement and/or a shortfall in delivery of Development Sites is identified via the Plan monitoring and review process which will be completed every 5 years.”</p> Housing allocation NPHAR6 should be extended to include the land to the west and up to the canal (as previously allocated). The number of houses allocated for site NPHAR6 in its extended form should be increase to 83 dwellings, retaining the same density of development as already approved and to facilitate the provision of an internal footpath “to enable future connection with the adjoining NPHAR4 and NPHAR5 and the canal footbridge to the north” as set out in the Design Codes for all three sites and described in the associated commentary and at various points with the DNP.
Rep 2	
Document	Submission plan + policies maps
Page	
Policy/Paragraph	H2 - Housing Site Allocations
Object to this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>Policy H2 (Housing Site Allocations) identifies the sites that are allocated for housing in the DNP. My client’s site at Millway Foods is identified as NPHAR6 (COLSTON LANE(MILLWAY)) in the DNP. Housing Table 3 notes that the site has outline planning permission for 53 dwellings (allowed on appeal to the Secretary of State) and that it is included in the emerging Melon Local Plan. 1.10 There are however serious errors in the ‘Design Code’ for the site (as described on page 26 of the DNP) and anomalies (conflicts) between the emerging Draft New Melton Local Plan and the DNP (of which the DNP must be in legal compliance).</p> <p>The extent of site NPHAR6 is identified on Housing Figure 1 (page 33) of the DNP. Whilst the extent of the land identified accords with the outline planning permission approved on appeal and in turn with the approval of up to 53 dwellings, the site allocation has been altered from the earlier iteration of the DNP and now excludes the adjoining land (in the same ownership) between site</p>

	<p>NPHAR6 and the canal to the west.</p> <p>The removal of this adjoining land from the overall allocation has not been discussed with my clients, despite meetings held with members of Harby Parish Council in which we made clear our intentions to propose additional housing development on this land, in the light of the Inspector’s findings in relation to the suitability of the site for housing.</p> <p>In the above connection, it is stated in the Design Code (page 26) that “An internal footpath is provided to enable future connection with the adjoining NPHAR4 & NPHAR5 and the canal footbridge to the north”. This same design requirement is also reiterated in relation to the allocated sites NPHAR4 and NPHAR5. However, the land required to achieve this connection has been excluded from the housing site allocation in the DNP. The DNP cannot therefore require this to be provided and is unsound on this basis</p> <p>Moreover, there is no requirement in the outline planning permission for this footpath connection to be made. Without the inclusion of my client’s additional land with site allocation NPHAR6, the footpath provision would not be achievable and cannot be required in the DNP.</p> <p>There is however a solution.</p> <p>We are of the opinion the provision of a footpath up to the canal bridge would be a public benefit. It is therefore submitted that the land to the west of the Millway site and up to the canal is also allocated in the DNP (as it was in the previous version of the DNP) for housing development and that the number of dwellings apportioned to the site is increased to 83 to reflect the additional site area approved for housing development.</p> <p>In the absence of an allocation of the entire site for 83 dwellings, there is no incentive for providing the footpath and currently there is no requirement to do so. The above would therefore be in the wider public interest</p> <p>In addition to the above, the submitted amendments would bring the DNP in line with the Draft Melton Local Plan, which is essential for the DNP to be sound and legally compliant. The Draft Melton Plan includes both parts of the site as a housing allocation, although the associated housing number of 53 dwellings fails to account for the fact that all this housing has been approved on a lesser site area. The approved outline planning permission is at a low density (approx. 24 dph) and in the interests of sustainable development it would therefore be appropriate to maintain this density across both sites, resulting in an overall provision of 83 houses.</p>
Suggested Change	<p>In the light of the above, it is submitted that Policy H1 and H2 should be amended to make the DNP compliant with the Draft Melton Local Plan, sound and legally compliant, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following text in Policy H1 should be omitted: <p>“The delivery level from the Development Sites will be increased through the</p>

	<p>release of Reserve Sites only if a higher residual requirement is identified when the Melton Local Plan is adopted which cannot be met from the Development Sites in Policy H2 or if new requirement and/or a shortfall in delivery of Development Sites is identified via the Plan monitoring and review process which will be completed every 5 years.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing allocation NPHAR6 should be extended to include the land to the west and up to the canal (as previously allocated). • The number of houses allocated for site NPHAR6 in its extended form should be increase to 83 dwellings, retaining the same density of development as already approved and to facilitate the provision of an internal footpath “to enable future connection with the adjoining NPHAR4 and NPHAR5 and the canal footbridge to the north” as set out in the Design Codes for all three sites and described in the associated commentary and at various points with the DNP.
<u>Name</u>	<u>John Rust</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	Submission plan in entirety
Policy/Paragraph	
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>I support the Long Lawson, Hose and Harby Neighbourhood Plan as submitted in all its aspects especially the compliance to the Leicestershire County Council HEDNA housing requirement of 170 dwellings per annum</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has been produced as required by the NPPF to be compliant to the Local Plan which unfortunately due to poor performance by the Melton Mowbray planning department has not yet been approved and unsound.</p> <p>The Local Plan is unsound due to:-</p> <p>After being party to producing the HEDNA and contributing to its cost (£9k) the MBC on realising that the HEDNA which provided a consistent, objective assessment of need for housing (OAN) following the approach prescribed by Government in Planning Practice Guidance and identifies an Objectively Assessed Need for the equivalent of 170 new dwellings each year from 2011 to 2036 for the Borough of Melton, was not supporting their figure of 245dpa they then commissioned their TAHR using the same consultant as the HEDNA at further cost so as to justify the original requirement of 245dpa. I am not convinced that there was or still is “justification for planning for between 5,750 and 7,000 dwellings”</p> <p>The Plan will cause major harm within the boroughs villages, by focusing on the 4000+ housing requirement in Melton to finance the relief road and still maintaining a 65% to 35% split between the town and villages.</p> <p>The large scale expansion of villages is based on a desktop and tick box</p>

	<p>sustainability assessments carried out by consultants who have little local knowledge. The increase in housing within the villages was then divided on a percentage of the existing population making their sustainability assessments meaningless.</p> <p>In a number of villages which due to past growth without a corresponding investment in infrastructure are now struggling to accommodate this proposed excessive growth. Water, Sewage, Surface water flooding, Roads, Pavements, Parking, Primary schools Medical Practises have been raised as major problems when actual planning applications have been considered so highlighting the lack of thoroughness in the Local Plan preparation. There is intention to improve the Melton Town infrastructure along with a new relief road, considering that 35% of the development will be in the villages it would have been expected that a proportionate investment in the rural infrastructure would be planned</p> <p>The plan makes no reference to the amount of traffic that will be generated on the already overloaded rural roads or the negative impact on climate change caused by car travel from remote villages North of Melton on the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire borders to areas of quality employment.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to produce a plan without overloading the rural infrastructure, destroying the historic rural character of the villages and the settings of their historic buildings and national monuments by building the fully serviced garden village next to the A46 trunk road at Six Hills. The propose 3000 dwellings would allow the villages to expand at a rate in line with local need and wishes of the residents in line with the neighbourhood plans, any borough housing shortfall being offset by the Six Hills Garden Village.</p>
Suggested Change	N/A"
<u>Name</u>	<u>Philip Goodman</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
<u>Rep 1</u>	
Document	Submission plan
Page	23
Policy/Paragraph	Policy H1 Housing Provision
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	<p>I support the Neighbourhood Plan's reliance on the annual housing figures as set out in the L&L HEDNA joint study of January 2017. The NP's use of this lower annual number (170 dwelling pa across the Borough) has informed the Regulation 16 housing numbers in the three villages which make up the NP area. In my view this is the most up-to-date Objective Analysis of (Housing) Need (OAN) for the borough as a whole. When cascaded down to the Parish level, in accordance with the overall proportion for Rural Service Centres in the emerging Local Plan, this provides the figures for the Parish used in NP Policy H1. Should the emerging LP succeed, through the forthcoming LP Examination process, in securing a higher annual number (245 new houses borough wide) then the H1 Policy has identified Reserve sites which could make up any identified deficit for this parish. In my view the approach is consistent with Paras 47-55 of the NPPF and its flexibility is robust. Hence Policy H1 is worthy of support.</p>

Suggested Change	N/A"
Rep 2	
Document	Submission plan
Page	24
Policy/Paragraph	Policy H2 and Table 3 - Housing Site Allocations
Support this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	The NP team carried out extensive research and local consultation to ensure that the NP met strategic housing needs (as set by the Borough's emerging MBC) while also responding positively to local circumstances and development opportunities. In my opinion the site allocations in Policy H2 and Table 3 are the best balance of meeting local housing needs and securing locally relevant and appropriate sustainable development. The slight differences in Allocation sites between the NP and the emerging LP reflect genuine local preferences. Inasmuch as different sites have been chosen in Hose and Long Clawson this is localism in practice. Since the NP would meet and exceed the assessed level of housing need and contains flexibility provisions to ensure adequate delivery of new housing, the NP is worthy of support.
Suggested Change	N/A
<u>Name</u>	<u>Elizabeth Watson</u>
Resident, Stakeholder, Consultee.	Resident
Rep 1	
Document	Policies Map
Page	
Policy/Paragraph	
Object to this policy/part of the plan	
Comment	I support the Neighbourhood Plan's reliance on the annual housing figures as set out in the L&L HEDNA joint study of January 2017. The NP's use of this lower annual number (170 dwelling pa across the Borough) has informed the Regulation 16 housing numbers in the three villages which make up the NP area. In my view this is the most up-to-date Objective Analysis of (Housing) Need (OAN) for the borough as a whole. When cascaded down to the Parish level, in accordance with the overall proportion for Rural Service Centres in the emerging Local Plan, this provides the figures for the Parish used in NP Policy H1. Should the emerging LP succeed, through the forthcoming LP Examination process, in securing a higher annual number (245 new houses borough wide) then the H1 Policy has identified Reserve sites which could make up any identified deficit for this parish. In my view the approach is consistent with Paras 47-55 of the NPPF and its flexibility is robust. Hence Policy H1 is worthy of support.
Suggested Change	N/A"
Rep 2	
Document	Submission plan
Page	24
Policy/Paragraph	Policy H2 and Table 3 - Housing Site Allocations
Support this policy/part of	

the plan	
Comment	<p>I believe it is ridiculous to even consider building off Canal Lane, Hose due to poor access and road conditions.</p> <p>In my opinion, village people were influenced to vote for Option 1 by whoever sent out the sheet of paper telling them to vote for this option and not the other three.</p>
Suggested Change	N/A