

**Wallington Neighbourhood Plan – Statutory consultee and Community comments received at Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Consultation
and proposed responses from the Steering Group**

Responses were received from (numbering corresponds to the 'Respondent' column in the table):

1. Resident
2. Resident
3. Resident
4. Resident
5. Resident
6. Resident
7. Resident
8. Resident
9. Resident
10. Resident
11. Resident
12. Resident
13. Historic England
14. Herts County Council – Rights
of Way / Heritage
15. Herts County Council –
Minerals and Waste Team
16. Anglian Water
17. North Herts DC

Comments are listed by paragraph number / policy, with general comments at the end

Ref.	Page/ Para	Respondent	Summary of comment	Response from Steering Group
1.	General	4	General acknowledgement.	Noted.
2.	General	11	No more development. Define the built core in layman’s terms.	Noted – the NDP is not allocating sites for development. This is defined in para 4.4 and the glossary.
3.	General	13	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan for Wallington, and consider that it contains a comprehensive positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the area's historic environment.	Noted.
4.	General	17	Firstly, the Wallington Neighbourhood plan refers to the Saved Policies 2 Local Plan. Our new Local Plan was adopted in November 2022, and this supersedes the Saved Policies of the previous plan. This needs to be updated throughout the document before proceeding to Regulation 16, the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Plan includes a number of strategic policies which policies in a neighbourhood plan should be in general conformity with to meet the “basic conditions”, which form the basis of the examination.	Noted – the Local Plan was adopted after the Regulation 14 consultation had commenced, hence adopted policy at the time was the previous Saved Policies 2 Local Plan. All references have been updated and a sense check carried out against the content of the adopted Local Plan.
5.	Para 1.3	3	Query reliability of 1831 census figures. Suggest that the highest popn figure was in 1841 (274 residents).	Amended to include 1841 figure.
6.	Para 1.6	12	There are six bells in the church of which five are old. The newest bell is 90 years old.	Amended.
7.	Census data	9	Can we update the plan with census 2021 data.	Yes - subject to availability. The LHNA would not be updated – this could happen at a later review of the LHNA.

8.	Para 2.4	9	Factual error – 8% not 10%.	Amended.
9.	Residents Survey	17	Check percentages	Checked and amended as necessary.
10.	Para 2.12	15	<p>Include after para 2.12 reference to the Development Plan including:</p> <p>The current adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan documents consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2011-2026 (adopted July 2014) • The Waste Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011-2026 (adopted November 2012) • The Minerals Local Plan 2002-2016 (adopted March 2007) <p>The adopted documents are also supported by the following Supplementary Planning Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Employment Land Areas of Search Supplementary Planning Document (adopted November 2015) • The Minerals Consultation Areas Supplementary Planning Document (adopted November 2007) <p>Link: https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/planning-in-hertfordshire/minerals-and-waste-planning/minerals-and-waste-planning.aspx</p>	These have been included.
11.	Para 2.11	9	Would be helpful to provide explanation about why the village has been recategorised to Category B.	Link to the relevant Local Plan evidence document has been provided.
12.	Para 3.2	9	Factual error, 43% not 62%	Amended.
13.	Para 3.16	9	Please add 'These issues should be factored into consideration of the feasibility and impact of any development plans'	Added in beneath bullet points.
14.	Para 3.16	12	Electricity	Add into the descriptions?

		<p>Mains electricity is supplied to all residential and public buildings. Being at the end of a distribution line the village is more susceptible to power cuts than some other areas.</p> <p>It is the only service provided to the church; in the listings of other services below none of these applies to the church</p> <p>Water Mains water is available to all properties</p> <p>Sewage Mains sewage is supplied to most properties. Of the remainder, some chose not to be connected when mains sewage came to the village, others were not offered connection as they were too far from the sewers installed. These properties have septic tanks.</p> <p>Gas There is no mains gas in the village. A few properties have calor gas tanks for central heating, a few have bottled gas for cooking.</p> <p>Oil (kerosene) Most properties use kerosene for central heating, held in oil tanks. See discussion below on heating.</p> <p>Telephone Fibre Fibre to the premises (fttp) is available for all properties although not all may be connected. This can provide both telephone and broadband connectivity. When there is a power cut these services are not available.</p> <p>Telephone copper A few properties still have a copper wire connection to the exchange; this connection still works when there is a power cut. This facility is likely to be withdrawn within the timescale covered by the plan</p> <p>Mobile telephone The mobile telephone reception in the village is very poor, especially at the north end of the village. 5G is a myth, some of us would be grateful for 1G. Smart phones with wifi calling help to mitigate some of the problems but see the discussion below on mobile signals.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>Respondent requests additional information on addressing mobile phone coverage</p> <p>Replacement of central heating boilers with carbon neutral systems Government advice is to replace oil / gas boilers with air source boilers. However much of the village housing stock is older or listed properties which are hard to insulate to very high standards. The older boilers run much hotter installations than air source systems (approx 70°C as opposed to 55°C) and so replacement would have to be of the whole central heating system not just the boiler, a prohibitive cost. The village of Swaffham Prior in Cambridgeshire has managed to provide a carbon neutral village-wide heating system. I attach a cutting from the Times several years ago when I first heard about this, and there is a lot on-line, but the best introduction to this is on BBC iplayer, ‘Morning Live’ program for 6th February 2023, starting about 12 minutes in. Swaffham Prior is about 6 times bigger than Wallington’s core but a village-wide solution seems worthy of consideration.</p>	<p>Policy W6 (Design to mitigate climate change) supports this ambition, including retrofitting of heritage properties.</p> <p>There is scope to include an additional clause to support community-scale energy schemes, such as the one mentioned in Swaffham. This has been added into Policy W6.</p>
15.	Para 3.17	17	<p>In terms of the number of dwellings, paragraph 3.7 says the majority of respondents (81%) feel that the number of new properties should not exceed 10. This equates to an increase of 24% of the current housing stock. We wanted to make you aware that 10 units would equate to an increase of 16%.</p>	<p>Amended.</p>
16.	Para 3.18	9	<p>Amend ‘wanting’ to ‘preferred’,</p>	<p>Unclear what is being referred to – no use of the word ‘wanting’ in this para.</p>
17.	Para 3.23 Vision	9	<p>Suggest removing reference to economic activity in the vision as not supported in the survey. Incorporate other key points into the vision.</p>	<p>The vision was agreed by the community at various events across the engagement process.</p>

18.	Housing Survey (p.10)	1	<p>Concern about a 24% increase in housing, which was a finding of the community Housing Survey (which equates to 10 houses over the plan period).</p> <p>Concern about infilling and farm conversions.</p> <p>Guard the natural environment, heritage and vistas and restrict expansion.</p>	<p>The Housing Survey was issued to local households and 81% of respondents considered that there should be no more than 10 new homes in the neighbourhood area across the plan period. This equates to a 16% rise on current stock. The NDP, however, does not allocate housing and any proposed development would be required to be delivered within the Village Confines (built core), likely to be infill.</p> <p>Infilling and farm conversions (within the Village Confines (built core)) is already permitted as per the Local Plan. The NDP seeks to more effectively define what is meant by the Village Confines (built core) so that any development, which is likely to be small-scale, is directed to the most sustainable locations.</p> <p>The NDP is not allocating sites. Infill is already permitted, the NDP seeks to ensure that this is directed to the most sustainable locations (i.e. the Village Confines). There are a range of policies in the NDP seeking to safeguard environmental assets, historic assets and views.</p>
19.	Housing Needs Survey	5	Concerned about the findings (e.g. the 24% increase)	See Ref 1.

20.	Housing Needs Survey	6	Concerned about the findings (e.g. the 24% increase).	See Ref 1.
21.	Local Housing Needs Assessment	9	Comments on the Local Housing Needs Survey.	Discussed, but the AECOM methodology followed the government-endorsed one. No changes.
22.	Policy W1: Location of Development	5	Inevitable that development will happen and the NDP sets to control/manage it. Would like to keep the village as is – beautiful with no significant change.	The NDP does not allocate additional housing in the neighbourhood area. Neither indeed does the NHDC District Plan (or emerging one). The Local Plan does enable infilling within the Village Confines (built core), but does not define what those are. The NDP seeks to define this and ensure that if new development is to take place, it is directed to the most sustainable locations.
23.	Policy W1: Location of Development	5	Why is Wallington to be reclassified in the NHDC District Plan when it has few facilities.	This is a decision that was taken at a strategic level and has been considered through the Local Plan examination. The Local Plan is now adopted.
24.	Policy W1: Location of Development and W3: Residential development within the built core	6	To increase household numbers does option of splitting large houses (in addition to brown field developments and “garden infill” developments) need to be considered?	Policy W1 supports the development of brownfield land, in preference to green field. Policy W3 seeks to restrict ‘garden grabbing’ which is considered to be detrimental to the local character of the village.
25.	Policy W1: Location Development	9	We need to clarify the report’s terminology regarding the preferred location of new dwellings. 80% of survey respondents wanted new dwellings to be located on Brownfield land, ie converting or replacing	Need to be mindful that infill is permitted – with or without the NDP.

			<p>existing buildings. This is not the same as Infill development which is repeatedly referred to in the report as being the village’s preferred location. Only 54% of respondents supported Infill on accessible parcels of land between other properties and 48% supported Infill in gardens between existing properties.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant since the preferred limit of ten new dwellings can be easily accommodated within Brownfield land available within the built core, without needing Infill development at all.</p> <p>Policy W1 Paragraph C refers to the preferred use of brownfield and farmyard land being preferable to land outside the built up area boundary but needs to specify that it is also preferable to Infill development.</p>	<p>We cannot express a preference for brownfield instead of infill because infill is permitted.</p>
26.	Policy W1: Location of Development	10	<p>Query how the built core has been defined. Why does it exclude the Paddock. Should farms be in the built core?</p>	<p>The group consider that an appropriate methodology has been followed to define the built core.</p>
27.	Policy W1: Location of Development	15	<p>‘Land at Bygrave Lodge Farm, Baldock’ (anaerobic digestion facility) is a waste management facility which falls within the Neighbourhood Plan area and is safeguarded under Policy 5 (Policy 5: Safeguarding of Sites) of the adopted Waste Local Plan.</p> <p>Any future proposals which come forward within the vicinity of this facility must accommodate to the existing facility and ensure that the developments will not prevent or prejudice the operation of the facility.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference to this has been made within the supporting text for Policy W1: Location of Development.</p>
28.	Policy W1: Location of Development	16	<p>Proposed policy W1 of the WNP proposes that development should be focused on the built core of the village and applies several criteria including B.ii. the reuse of redundant buildings and:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>B.iv. it relates to necessary utility infrastructure</i></p>	<p>Noted for information.</p>

			<p>Anglian Water’s Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) was subject to public consultation in 2022. All the defined Wallington Built Core area is within or immediately adjacent to the existing Sandon WRC catchment area. All sites included in the draft WNP could technically be connected although this would involve a longer length/higher carbon intensive network extension for sites at the southern end of the Built Core area.</p>	
29.	Policy W2: Meeting Local Housing Need	6	<p>Can the definition of affordable housing be fully defined.</p> <p>Tenure of housing could impact the dynamics and population of the village.</p> <p>Do proposed developments in Redhill (Sandon Parish) need to be considered?</p>	<p>Add NPPF definition to the Glossary.</p> <p>Policy W2 requires developers to heed the findings of the Local Housing Needs Assessment, which has followed the government-endorsed methodology.</p> <p>The NDP can only influence planning policy within the neighbourhood area. The Plan does not seek to allocate housing.</p>
30.	Policy W2: Meeting Local Housing Needs	9	<p>From our previous meetings, I had understood that this section had been deleted and replaced with the Vision & Objectives section within pages 10-14. I reattach my comments from 1st February 2021 for reference and remain extremely unhappy with many points made in 5.2 to 5.6, particularly any comparisons with “the North Herts district and wider region” which are both irrelevant and misleading. I don’t know why this section has been put back in but am happy to substantially re-write it (again) if necessary or delete it entirely.</p> <p>Policy W2 A We need to clarify references to Affordable Housing across the report since it is defined in the Glossary as housing for those whose needs are not met by the market including subsidised home ownership</p>	<p>The section draws from the factual findings of the Local Housing Needs Assessment prepared by AECOM in line with government guidance. This is an important policy to retain to ensure that any new housing development in the neighbourhood area delivers against locally identified housing needs.</p> <p>We will the full NPPF definition into the glossary.</p>

			<p>and / or for essential local workers” which is only relevant for major developments of 10+ houses. If the report means to refer to housing which is more economic or cheaper, it should say so. Otherwise, this section A should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy W2 C also refers to community-led housing projects including co-operative housing which is also completely irrelevant herein. Please delete.</p>	<p>A rural exception site could in theory come forward outside the build core. Therefore the policy is considered to be relevant.</p>
31.	Policy W2: Meeting Local Housing Needs	17	<p>On location, the Neighbourhood Plan suggests that 80% of the survey respondents feel that the conversion or replacement of existing buildings such as redundant farm buildings within the village is preferred. It goes on to say that a substantial portion of the land within the village is occupied by redundant farm buildings at Manor and Bury Farmyards which, if developed, would provide more than enough space for up to ten new properties which is the number identified in the survey. It is not clear whether these new homes would be market or affordable houses.</p> <p>On tenure, the Neighbourhood Plan states that the central village has two rented social housing homes and a relatively high proportion of privately rented accommodation, accounting for 13 homes in total or 31% of the total housing stock in the built core. However, this should be 24% if all 54 residential properties included in the survey are within the built core.</p> <p>For type of housing, respondents said one of the key issues was a shortage of more affordable and smaller homes (one, two and three bed homes) within the village. Smaller homes for market sale for downsizers and first time buyers and 57% of respondents thought that the provision of affordable (social) housing should be a priority.</p>	<p>This has been amended in the introductory text.</p>

		<p>Our understanding is that one of the overarching objectives of the Wallington Neighbourhood Plan is to provide smaller, more affordable homes to allow for young people and families to move into the village and to allow elderly residents to downsize. This objective is supported by the results of the Wallington residential local housing survey which was carried out in 2021. This objective is reflected in Policy W2.</p> <p>We support the making of policies which ensure suitable housing type, size and tenure is delivered to meet the local housing need. However, criterion a) in Policy W2 could be considered as redundant as all development schemes above ten units must comply with our Local Plan affordable housing policy.</p> <p>The reference to First Homes should be removed as most developers have cited that the delivery of First Homes is not a viable option. Our Housing Officer has advised that the likely discount across the district will only be 30% which would not be affordable to most people. If First Homes are delivered in Wallington and local people are unable to afford the properties, then they would be marketed to people across the district and ultimately outside the district if no potential purchasers. Therefore, there is a possibility that these properties would not meet the identified local housing need. There are also other restrictions that apply which may preclude local people from purchasing such homes.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan states that respondents of the residential survey showed 48% generally supported the provision of rented accommodation and given the low number of social/affordable units within the village, we would suggest the provision of affordable housing for both rent and shared ownership (which would be retained in perpetuity) would be beneficial to provide homes for local people and ensure sustainability of the village.</p>	<p>The Government has set out that a minimum of 25% of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions should be First Homes.</p> <p>The Parish would like to retain the clause, which may be relevant for instance if a rural exception site were to be developed in the future.</p>
--	--	---	--

32.	Para 5.10	9	Backland development not discussed in the survey – why mentioned?	This finding has come from the Conservation Area Statement and the AECOM Design Guidance and Code (section 4), both of which note that backland development would not be in keeping with local character (existing settlement pattern). The NDP includes definitions of infill, backland and windfall development.
33.	Policy W3: Residential development within the built core	9	Clause A – reorder i) and ii)	Amended
34.	Policy W3: Residential development within the built core	15	Scope to include policy wording on the reduction of waste and encourage greater rates of recycling through providing sufficient storage areas. Wording on waste reduction measures and waste storage areas could be added as a criterion(s) to Policy W3: Residential Development Within the Built Core or as supporting text to the policy.	Noted and added as an additional clause.
35.	Policy W3: Residential development within the built core	17	Policy W3 describes infilling development within the build core as extensions or new development in between existing residential dwellings. However, it is our view that infilling development is development that takes places anywhere within the built core including previously developed sites. We understand that Policy W2 prescribes a threshold of two units for infilling development. It is our opinion that this policy will restrict your plan’s objective of achieving affordable housing within the village. As stated above, our Local Plan’s affordable housing requirements are only triggered on housing schemes of 10 plus units and for S106 agreements the threshold is for ten plus units. Therefore, if future planning schemes are limited to two units there would be no requirement to provide these as affordable homes. To	

		<p>achieve affordable housing in Wallington and Rushden, a rural exception site could be delivered outside of the village core on greenfield land or the village would have to rely on the landowner's good will to market the land at a lower price.</p> <p>From our experience, setting a size threshold on infill development can lead to an inefficient use of space. It is our view that development proposals for infilling development should be considered on a case-by-case basis to reflect the size of the land and the character of the area. As highlighted in our informal comments, Paragraphs 124 and 125 of the NPPF identifies that local planning authorities must ensure efficient development on land and to ensure developments achieve appropriate housing densities.</p> <p>It is our view that Policy W3 restricts future planning opportunities to provide the right type of housing to meet the identified housing need. In reality, if infill development was capped at two units and the plot of land was of a considerable size, there would be a point of contention between the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives and the NPPF. To satisfy both, it is likely a developer would build two larger homes to comply with both policies and these will be marketed at a higher rate due to their size and location. We would also point out that the residential survey identified that 66% of residents agreed that terrace housing would be suitable in the village. However, Policy W2 would preclude terraced housing as they count as three plus units.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has identified Manor Farm as an ideal site for redevelopment for up to ten properties. The Council agrees with this approach of identifying suitable brownfield sites which could be redeveloped for housing or for employment use. However, brownfield sites would also have to comply with policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. If they are located within the defined village core, Policy W3 would restrict the site to providing two units under the current</p>	<p>Clause Ai amended to allow for greater flexibility in terms of numbers when it comes to brownfield former agricultural sites.</p> <p>The WNP supports the re-use of brownfield/ former agricultural sites, which could accommodate greater numbers of homes than would typically be anticipated as infill. In other sites within the built core, infill is likely to be smaller numbers of homes.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>wording. It is also not clear from the Neighbourhood Plan if it is the intention to market these new properties at full market value or affordable and there would be no requirement under our Local Plan policy to make these homes affordable as it would bring forward under eleven units.</p> <p>With regard to private amenity space in Policy W3, we recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan provides additional explanatory text which explains what private amenity space is and how it can be measured. We would also recommend the Neighbourhood Plan to set a percentage threshold to ensure that there is clear understanding to what is considered to be an unacceptable loss of private amenity space. The policies in Neighbourhood Plan form part of the basis for planning and development control decisions and therefore, they need to be clear and unambiguous. Otherwise, when assessing planning applications, the Planning Officer will have to interpret what is an unacceptable loss.</p>	<p>Define and refer to Design Guide:</p> <p>Residential amenity is not defined in law. In planning terms, 'amenity' is often used to refer to the quality or character of an area and elements that contribute to the overall enjoyment of an area. Residential amenity considers elements that are particularly relevant to the living conditions of a dwelling.</p> <p>Residential amenity has a significant and valuable impact on the way in which people use their homes. The health and well-being of residents is often directly related to the level of residential amenity occupants can enjoy. It is a duty of the planning system to support sustainable development. Sustainable development incorporates a social role which seeks to secure well designed, strong, vibrant and healthy communities. When assessing how a</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>W3 - We support and encourage the making of design codes to deliver good design that is sympathetic to the village. However, we feel that</p>	<p>development proposal may impact on the existing amenity of an area and living conditions of nearby occupiers, the following issues would be significant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Privacy How would the development proposals affect privacy levels? 2. Overbearing effects Would the scale of development and its proximity to other buildings result in an oppressive environment? 3. Natural light and outlook Would the development provide existing or proposed properties with sufficient outlook and natural lighting levels thereby avoiding significant overshadowing and enclosure? 4. Environmental effects Would the development cause or be exposed to any other environmental effects? 5. Other design guidance How does the design of the proposal promote a good standard of amenity? <p>Within the built core, there are possibly only three to four dwellings that do not have direct highway</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>requiring all new developments to have a direct highway frontage is not necessary and it might restrict future development. We note that some homes within the villages do not have a direct highway frontage so this would not be out of character for Wallington and Rushden.</p> <p>Criterion x of Policy W3 is considered to be redundant as connecting to key infrastructure would be a requirement under Development Control.</p>	<p>access. Therefore this requirement is not deemed to be out of character. The predominant characteristic is that dwellings have access to the highway directly – as noted in the Design Guidance and the Conservation Area Character Statement.</p> <p>Deleted.</p>
36.	Policy W4: Reinforcing Wallington's Local Character through Design	13	<p>A minor recommendation is that the word 'avoid' should be added to the beginning of clause IV of Policy W4 in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 195.</p>	<p>Amended as suggested.</p>
37.	Policy W4: Reinforcing Wallington's Local Character through Design	14	<p>We would wish the authors to note and represent in the plan that: Proposals for new development should not lead to the loss of Public Rights of Way. The network will be added to, upgraded (e.g. Footpath to Bridleway) and surface improved to enable short, everyday journeys on foot or cycle and enhance the opportunity for recreation on foot, horse and cycle. The strategic principles of the Hertfordshire County Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be adopted where development is being considered. See www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/row</p> <p>Amend policy as follows (add green and delete red):</p>	<p>Added into the supporting text for the policy.</p> <p>Amended as suggested.</p>

			<p>viii. Ensuring safe pedestrian, and where feasible cycle/equestrian, access to link up with the existing footpath Public Rights of Way network; and</p> <p>x. Ensuring that traffic generation and parking does not adversely affect vehicular and pedestrian safety. The use of sustainable transport modes should be promoted by providing space for cycle parking, improving Public Rights of Way infrastructure and provision of electric vehicle charging points.</p>	Amended as suggested.
38.	Policy W4: Reinforcing Wallington's Local Character through Design	14	Policy W4's aspiration to maintain local character in new builds. HCC supports this and suggests this should include a requirement that site master planning and site layouts reflect historic character as well as appearance.	Noted. Added in additional wording to this effect into the policy.


39.	Policy W4: Reinforcing Wallington's Local Character through Design	17	Policy W4, criterion v, the Plan cannot set timings for when outdoor lighting should be turned off and this cannot be enforced. Instead, the plan could put in policies to ensure appropriate lighting design for rural areas such as the direction of the lighting.	<p>Rephrase to: follow the guidance on lighting provided in the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Note GN01: The Reduction of Obtrusive Light (and any subsequent revisions) is adhered to. Proposals should consider carefully, and provide details of, the light source and intensity being used, the luminaire design, height, and angle, adding baffles and cut-off shields where required, and details of control mechanisms to dim or switch off lighting schemes when not required. Where appropriate, lights should be controlled by passive infrared detectors so that they only come on when needed.</p> <p>Supporting text – encourage people to turn off lights at nightfall</p>
40.	Policy W5: Heritage Assets in Wallington	13	We welcome particularly Section 6: Design, Character and Heritage, including the brief but nonetheless informative summary of the area's special historic and architectural interest. We welcome specifically the positive identification of local heritage assets of interest and their protection via policy W5.	Noted.
41.	Policy W5: Heritage Assets in Wallington	14	Policy W5 preamble at 6.17 considers non-designated heritage assets, these assets do not solely consist of built heritage and/or lists of locally significant buildings but also below and above ground archaeological remains and historic landscapes too, so it would be helpful to explore if these have been assessed for inclusion by the authors of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. The Working Group has focused on those historic assets that have been cited as particularly important to the community and has worked within the capacity available to the group in compiling this list.

			<p>The archaeological report noted in footnote 22 is not a report but a list of Historic Environment Record (HER) entries for the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). These should be assessed as to whether they should be part of conservation measures included within the NP.</p> <p>Broadly, Policy W5 does not go beyond the content of the NPPF. Whilst it is encouraging to see archaeology included in the NP, HCC suggests any local distinctiveness should be properly considered for inclusion and conservation in the NP</p>	
42.	Policy W5: Heritage Assets in Wallington	17	<p>The Council supports the designation of non-designated heritage assets and the requirement of producing Heritage Statements to ensure new development does not impact the identified heritage assets within the village.</p> <p>To assist with this, it is recommended a catchment buffer is added to Policy W5 to trigger the requirement of Heritage Statements.</p>	<p>Added into the supporting text:</p> <p>When is it necessary to submit a Heritage Statement?</p> <p>If a planning application seeks permission for a proposed development affecting a heritage asset or its setting; this would include applications for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A development to a Listed building or NHDA b. A development in the setting/adjacent to a listed building or NHDA c. A development to properties (Inc. outline) in a conservation area, and d. A development in the setting of, or adjacent to, a conservation area

				e. Wider countryside location where likely to be archaeological deposits.
43.	Policy W6: Design to mitigate climate change	14	6.24. Opportunities to promote sustainability and climate mitigation in Wallington include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using materials that optimise insulation, to Passivhaus or equivalent standards; • integrating renewable energy systems into new development and enabling the retrofitting of existing, older buildings; • reducing water consumption for instance through rainwater harvesting or grey water systems; and • encouraging a shift to more sustainable and active travel by linking development to and improving the Public Rights of Way and cycleway network, and providing electric vehicle charging points; 	Added in text in green to the wording.
44.	6.27	3	Factual correction: re Orwell residency	Amended text.
45.	Policy W7: Locally Significant Views	3	KV2, KV16, KV18 – additional factual information provided.	Added to the descriptions.
46.	Policy W7: Locally Significant Views	9	No reference to KV19 and KV20 in the survey – should they be included?	These views were specifically raised at a local consultation event and considered to be suitable for inclusion.
47.	Policy W7: Locally significant views	10	KV20: strongly unresponsive. Unclear how the views have been identified. KV20 appears to have been added late on.	The view was raised at a consultation event. It was reviewed and was considered to be significant from a local perspective. Local residents took part in a local views walk, views were also raised in the survey and at local events.
48.	Policy W8: Green and Blue infrastructure	10	The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the trees within the curtilage of Wallington Chase itself, but not the paddock beyond. Needs to be amended in Figure 7.1 (significant trees).	The map mirrors the CA Statement in terms of significant areas of trees.

49.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	2	<p>LGS 6: Plough Paddock and adjacent road space – do not support the space:</p> <p>This ‘paddock’ was previously part of the garden of the Plough when it was a pub and was bought in good faith as such. Initially we continued to mow it to keep it tidy but were then asked by Janet if she could graze her sheep on it and we took the opportunity to put up a new fence to make it look smarter at the same time as allowing her animals to graze.</p> <p>I am disappointed that this ex-garden area has been included as a village green space and I think this categorisation is not substantiated by much at all. We fully recognise that this is an incredibly sensitive part of the village and for any form of change here we would, as always, seek to involve the village, but to call it a ‘Green Space’ is to limit its use significantly into future.</p> <p>We did on one or two occasions let people use it during the village fete but it is not as you say in your plan ‘Often used by residents for local events’. It now seems as if that favour was taken as an excuse to define it as being some kind of permanent village space which I think is unreasonable. We have absolutely no plans to propose any kind of change on that land in the near future but we just don’t know what will be appropriate for future generations, but if it is categorised as Green Space its use will be pre-defined and severely restricted.</p> <p>In particular I object to the ‘adjacent roadside space’ being included as a ‘Green Space’. This is not a green space. We let people use it as car park at present but it really does seem very unreasonable to try to label it in this way for no apparent green gain to the village and it seems as if the council wish to gain control over an area which is after all private land.</p>	<p>The Working Group has discussed this and agreed to remove the area adjacent to the road from the LGS boundary, which is currently used for car parking.</p>
50.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	3	<p>LGS8 and LGS – factual information provided.</p> <p>Potential additional spaces:</p>	<p>Much engagement took place on the LGS. The list of LGS will be reviewed as part of a future review of the WNP.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas south of and adjacent to Church Lane - Earwigs Spinney 	
51.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	7	<p>LGS13 Wallington Common – Unsupportive of the proposal to designate as a LGS. Numerous reasons provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is well outside the village envelope. 2. It is not within reasonable proximity of the village being at least 1km distant. 3. It is surrounded by agricultural land. 4. It is 10.4 acres in area. 5. While riders and walkers sometimes use the Bridleway along its eastern side, the Common itself is seldom visited. 6. Parishioners of Wallington may benefit from it already and it is on the Commons Register. 7. It has no vehicular access within 1.0kms. 8. It has no particular historic significance apart from being an area over which the inhabitants of a few properties in the parish of Wallington had or have common grazing or other rights. 	<p>This has been discussed. It is considered that properties in Wallington have rights to use the Common land for their own use. PC (parishioners) pays for insurance for the site.</p> <p>There is no set definition as to what comprises ‘close proximity to the community it serves’ and this is likely to vary in the context of the neighbourhood area. As a rural parish, it is considered that spaces further afield from the village core are likely to serve local residents.</p> <p>The agreement is to retain the space.</p>
52.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	8	LGS8: Suggested amendment to the boundary of Kitt’s Piece.	<p>Having reviewed the site, it has been agreed the Kitt’s Piece LGS does not include the area outlined in red to the left in the respondent’s representation.</p>

				
53.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	10	<p>LGS2 The Chase Meadow: strongly unresponsive. Concerns about how the LGS have been identified.</p> <p>Amend wording of Policy to ensure it aligns with national policy.</p>	<p>Noted. This space has been identified with the community through the engagement process. It is considered to meet the NPPF criteria. Therefore the site has been retained.</p> <p>The policy is considered to align with national policy.</p>
54.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	12	<p>Page 92 Appendix F Item LGS7 St Mary's Churchyard I am told that any parishioner is entitled to be buried in the churchyard. (Need to check this statement with regard to persons of non-Christian religions)</p>	Noted for information.

55.	Policy W9: Local Green Spaces	17	<p>Generally, we support the designation of Local Green Spaces. To designate Local Green Spaces conditions found in paragraphs 101 to 103 of the NPPF need to be met. Paragraph 102 of the NPPF sets out a criterion for designating Local Green Spaces. The Neighbourhood Planning steering group must be confident that each site satisfies the NPPF criteria.</p> <p>It is advised that the Neighbourhood plan should include confirmation that the land owners of the proposed sites agree to this designation as this type of designation would give the land the same safeguarding protection as Green Belt, in accordance to paragraph 103 of the NPPF. This means development cannot take place on this site except in special circumstances.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. All landowners have been contacted. It is not essential that landowners support the designation:</p> <p>Planning guidance states: <u>Does land need to be in public ownership?</u></p> <p>A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership. However, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan. Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 37-019-20140306</p>
-----	----------------------------------	----	---	--

			<p>In appendix F, it is acknowledged that LGS1 is a privately owned garden. It is our view that this land is an important space in the Wallington Conservation Area. However, it does not meet the criterion set out in paragraph 102 of the NPPF as it does not say that it has any community use and therefore value to the community. Unless the land owner confirms to the designation, we feel that this site does not meet the requirements.</p> <p>For Plough Paddock, car parking is included within the information about this site. We advise that this use does not meet the conditions of paragraph 102 of the NPPF. If the Neighbourhood Plan wants to protect the space for car parking, we would suggest the plan includes a policy specifically for this purpose.</p>	<p>The site is considered to meet the NPPF criteria in terms of being demonstrably special for wildlife, beauty and historic reasons. It is not required to meet all five (i.e. and recreational and tranquility reasons) to be demonstrably special. The site owner put forward the site originally and was part of the working group.</p> <p>The area currently used for car parking space has been removed from the boundary of the LGS as has reference to it in the description.</p>
56.	Policy W10	5	The farm could be a farm again and the village return to its roots.	Agreed, but this is not something the NDP can influence. The definition provided by NHDC for those villages to be considered for infill (i.e. Category B) is very broad – e.g. sufficient for a village to simply have a village hall. This was considered by the PC at the time, but the agreement was that there were no technical grounds on which this could have been challenged.
57.	Policy W10: Rural enterprise	9	- Do we have any evidence of support for rural enterprise?	There are numerous community members who work locally (at home for example) in the village.
58.	Area Profile	9	SWOT - Weaknesses: It's wrong to say that there are few suitable properties for young families. There are a representative and	Add the word 'available'.

			<p>reasonable number of suitable properties. The problem is that they are not available.</p> <p>Opportunities: The reference to Social Housing / Affordable Housing is irrelevant and misleading, as per Policy W2 above. Please amend or delete.</p>	<p>This has been identified as a local need within the Local Housing Needs Assessment and has therefore been retained.</p>
59.	Policies Map	10	<p>Maps do not show the southern driveway into Wallington Chase from the road that serves the church and Bury Farm, which is an adopted unclassified road. AECOM report also misses this.</p>	<p>The most recently available OS base mapping has been used.</p>
60.	Evidence Base	14	<p>Appendix: List of Evidence, the Historic Environment Record (HER) is maintained by HCC and not Historic England or IHBC.</p>	<p>Amended.</p>
61.	Section 10 - Developer Contributions	17	<p><u>Developer Contributions</u></p> <p>We understand that the Parish Council is keen to influence the way in which developer contributions should be spent. This is set out in section 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan. We would like to make the Parish Council aware that the threshold for section 106 agreements is 10 units under one application. In this instance, it is unlikely that developer contributions will be received in Wallington as there are no allocations for housing in the Local Plan and it is considered that only infilling development is acceptable within the village core that would be unlikely to exceed this threshold based upon the draft policies.</p> <p>However the west of the Parish (in particular) will be close to the significant developments that are being proposed by the Council around Baldock. If there are projects or improvements that the Parish Council might wish to see (partially) funded by this development these could be identified. Any projects or funding would need to meet the legal requirements of being necessary and sufficiently related to the proposed development to justify any requests.</p>	<p>Noted – whilst the Parish may not receive contributions from development in the Parish, it does have opportunity to apply to the LA fund.</p>

			Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a planning charge, introduced by the Planning Act 2008, as a tool for local authorities in England and Wales to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of their area. This charge would apply to all housing development. If CIL were to be implemented, then it is likely that the village could receive some modest contributions.	
62.	Teenage provision	5	No play provision for teenagers.	This has been added as a non-policy action.
63.	Access	5	The plan does not comment enough on limitations of access, unsuitability for people without cars.	This was considered but the Working Group, who decided that the existing footpath network was adequate and no policy required. There is also an on-demand bus service available. There is limited public transport – agreed.
64.	Carbon neutrality	12	There is very little in the plan about carbon neutral issues, probably because when the plan was first envisioned these were not as well publicised as they are now. These need to be included.	Policy W6 (Design to mitigate climate change) addresses this issue. The scope of the policy is bound by Building Regulations. Include information about the Future Homes Standard in the supporting text, which will be introduced in 2025. Adding point in Policy W6 to support community-scale energy schemes.
65.	Additional points	12	Having a plan is an excellent idea but it should not be just about the future - there are some items which need addressing now . I submit that the items on mobile phone reception and carbon neutral replacement of central heating boilers come under this heading	Agreed, although these issues fall outside the scope of planning policy that can be influenced through the Neighbourhood Plan.
66.	Additional points	16	General information provided from Anglian Water about their strategy.	No specific amendments required to the Neighbourhood Plan.

