

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
1	1	3			Supportive of the Vision.		
1	2	3			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
1	3	3			Supportive of Policy 1.		
1	4	3			Supportive of Policy 2.		
1	5	3			Supportive of Policy 3.		
1	6	3			Supportive of Policy 4.		
1	7	3			Supportive of Policy 5.		
1	8	3			Supportive of Policy 6.		
1	9	3			Supportive of Policy 7.		
1	10	3			Supportive of Policy 8.		
1	11	3			Supportive of Policy 9.		
1	12	3			Supportive of Policy 10.		
1	13	3			Supportive of Policy 11.		
1	14	3			Supportive of Policy 12.		
1	15	3			Supportive of Policy 13.		
1	16	3			Supportive of Policy 14.		
1	17	3			Supportive of Policy 15.		
1	18	3			Supportive of Policy 16.		
2	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
2	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
2	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
2	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
2	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
2	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
2	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
2	8	1			Supportive of Policy 6.		
2	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
2	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
2	11	1			Supportive of Policy 9.		
2	12	1			Supportive of Policy 10.		
2	13	1			Supportive of Policy 11.		
2	14	1			Supportive of Policy 12.		
2	15	1			Supportive of Policy 13.		
2	16	1			Supportive of Policy 14.		
2	17	1			Supportive of Policy 15.		
2	18	1			Supportive of Policy 16.		
3	1	2			Supportive of the Vision.		
3	2	2			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
3	3	2			Supportive of Policy 1.		
3	4	2			Supportive of Policy 2.		
3	5	2			Supportive of Policy 3.		
3	6	2			Supportive of Policy 4.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
3	7	2		First time buyers deserve consideration.	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
3	8	2			Supportive of Policy 6.		
3	9	2			Supportive of Policy 7.		
3	10	2			Supportive of Policy 8.		
3	11	2			Supportive of Policy 9.		
3	12	2			Supportive of Policy 10.		
3	13	2			Supportive of Policy 11.		
3	14	2			Supportive of Policy 12.		
3	15	2			Supportive of Policy 13.		
3	16	2			Supportive of Policy 14.		
3	17	2			Supportive of Policy 15.		
3	18	2			Supportive of Policy 16.		
3	ADD	2		Traffic speed on Retford Rd & Main St is still very much a concern despite speed humps. Between the College and the houses opposite, barely room for huge tractors to get through when cars approach in the opposite direction. Lefthand verges suffered where they have mounted the pavement. Bulk lorries, industrial-sized tractors & delivery vans ignore the 'minor distraction' of speed bumps. If the village is to grow, then this will have to be addressed. The situation is dangerous.	<u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Concerned about: Traffic speeds. Roads too narrow where tractors / large vehicles meet oncoming traffic.	Traffic speeds, volumes and road capability are recognised as problem areas. The plan has been amended to include an additional Project 5 ie "To work closely with NCC highways to examine road improvements in respect of traffic calming, road signage and improvements to highways infrastructure"	Plan amended - Project 5 created.
4	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
4	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
4	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
4	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
4	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
4	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
4	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
4	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
4	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
4	11	1			Supportive of Policy 9.		
4	12	1			Supportive of Policy 10.		
4	13	1			Supportive of Policy 11.		
4	14	1			Supportive of Policy 12.		
4	15	1			Supportive of Policy 13.		
4	16	1			Supportive of Policy 14.		
4	17	1			Supportive of Policy 15.		
4	18	1			Supportive of Policy 16.		
5	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
5	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
5	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
5	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
5	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
5	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
				5	7	1	
5	8	1			Supportive of Policy 6.		
5	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
5	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
5	11	1			Supportive of Policy 9.		
5	12	1			Supportive of Policy 10.		
5	13	1			Supportive of Policy 11.		
5	14	1			Supportive of Policy 12.		
5	15	1			Supportive of Policy 13.		
5	16	1			Supportive of Policy 14.		
5	17	1			Supportive of Policy 15.		
5	18	1			Supportive of Policy 16.		
6	1	2			Supportive of the Vision.		
6	2	2			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
6	3	2			Supportive of Policy 1.		
6	4	2			Supportive of Policy 2.		
6	5	2			Supportive of Policy 3.		
6	6	2			Supportive of Policy 4.		
6	7	2			Supportive of Policy 5.		
6	8	2	2	Concerned about the impact a multi-use community building would have in Mattersey Thorpe in relation to noise, access, size and location.	Policy 6 Concerns over loss in amenity	Policy 6 amended to include those specific concerns in relation to any proposed enhancement.	Policy 6 amended
6	9	2	2	There should be no exceptional circumstances concerning these green spaces. They should be fully protected.	Policy 7 Concerns: Fully protect green spaces - No exceptional circumstances .	Policy 7 amended to remove the phrase "exceptional circumstances". Policy also strengthened to ensure that new facilities and associated infrastructure do not undermine their designation as green spaces.	Policy 7 amended
6	10	2			Supportive of Policy 8.		
6	11	2			Supportive of Policy 9.		
6	12	2			Supportive of Policy 10.		
6	13	2			Supportive of Policy 11.		
6	14	2			Supportive of Policy 12.		
6	15	2			Supportive of Policy 13.		
6	16	2			Supportive of Policy 14.		
6	17	2			Supportive of Policy 15.		
6	18	2			Supportive of Policy 16.		
7	1	2		It is an optimistic vision that allows for growth, whilst maintaining the values of village life.	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.
7	2	2		It appears to include all aspects of village development in a balanced way.	Supportive of the Community Objectives.	Noted.	Noted.
7	3	2		It would maintain a village feel without merging the two parts into a small town. The landscape is largely open, affording views of fields, church, rooftops, trees - giving a sense of place within the community.	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
7	4	2		It would prevent industrialisation and keep the old agricultural heritage. New developments should embrace modern technology in a way that is sympathetic to the existing environment.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
7	5	2		It is a responsible but reasonably progressive way of dealing with small building plots.	Supportive of Policy 3.	Noted.	Noted.
7	6	2		So as to ensure that developers do not add features to property within the conservation zone that detract from their requirement.	Supportive of Policy 4.	Noted.	Noted.
7	7	2		As the population is aging, people may want to downsize but remain part of the community in which they have lived. It would meet the need of different generations and socio-economic groups.	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
7	8	2		We would support the idea of a small community facility to foster a sense of social togetherness.	Supportive of Policy 6.	Appendix A of the Plan includes a project to provide a new multi-use facility on the football club changing rooms site in Mattersey Thorpe.	Noted.
7	9	2		These are important to the visual appearance of the villages and encourage activity and healthy lifestyle.	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
7	10	2		By creating safe walking routes it encourages people out of their homes, get to know neighbours. The more accessible and used these are, the less they would be abused.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
7	11	2		Concern about traffic entering the village around the bend from Ranskill at the entrance to this area.	Policy 9 Concerns over traffic speeds	Recognise traffic speeds as an ongoing issue. Notts Highways recommended a 2-metre kerbed footway across the site frontage plus an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing to the Millennium Green. No concerns were received from Notts Highways in respect of traffic approaching to the site during the site assessment stage. A future development proposal would also be subject to a planning application, where the specific site proposals relating to entering and leaving the site, plus off-road parking and 'line of sight' concerns would be subject to statutory consultation with Highways and residents.	Noted.
7	12	2		It is a safe place with other properties around.	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
7	13	2		There is adequate space and a suitable approach. We would want the trees and verges to remain, with houses shielded behind.	Supportive of Policy 11.	The trees are subject to a 'Tree Preservation Order'. This site has been granted planning application approval for 7 dwellings. It requires an access road leading to the proposed dwellings, behind the existing trees and hedges.	Noted.
7	14	2		Safe access, still allowing open space between villages.	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
7	15	2		It could enhance the heart of the village, but should be limited to no more than double-storey height.	Policy 13 Concerns over building height.	The proposed site is within the Conservation Area and in close proximity to a listed building and heritage assets, therefore subject to strict governance over scale, design, appearance, materials and access, as required by the Conservation Office to ensure that "development is with minimal or no harm to the character and appearance of the setting of the listed building."	Noted.
7	16	2			Supportive of Policy 14.		
7	17	2			Supportive of Policy 15.		
7	18	2			Supportive of Policy 16.		
7	ADD	2		The appearance of the village could be enhanced further by planting more bulbs/shrubs at the entrance verges - not just daffodils, but perhaps others for different times of the year. Flower troughs could be situated at points throughout the village (perhaps each maintained by a volunteer family, as in other villages). This can increase the sense of pride in a neighbourhood. They would not need to be as large as Ranskill/Sutton, ie 2-tier not 3, perhaps a slim rectangular shape placed back from the road so still enabling prams or wheelchairs to pass easily.	<u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Supportive comments suggesting village appearance could be improved by more planting in key areas.	Agreed that the village could be enhanced by additional planting. Parish council would take this forward as part of day-to-day business, by consulting residents with a view to establishing what planting is wanted and at which locations.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
7	ADD	2		Traffic Humps : Although not specific to the plan, we are concerned that these cause additional wear to vehicles. We have had broken suspension springs - even though we go over them very slowly. A staggered gateway entrance may be more effective and also create a visually acceptable 'rural ' setting that would give a sense of enclosing the village in a safe way.	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Concerns about traffic speed humps. impact upon vehicles.	Speed humps were introduced as a response to combat excessively speeding traffic. Village gateways were amongst the options, but evidence showed effectiveness soon wore off, hence speed humps - to provide a physical barrier. However, this may benefit from a further look as part of the Project 5, which states: "To work closely with NCC highways to examine road improvements in respect of traffic calming, road signage and improvements to highways infrastructure"	Plan amended - Project 5 created.
8	1	1		It's what I want for the village	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.
8	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
8	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
8	4	1		Because houses built reflect what is already there.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
8	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
8	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
8	7	1		Already mixed housing types in both Mattersey and Thorpe.	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
8	8	1			Supportive of Policy 6.		
8	9	1		Because we're a village and rural areas are needed to keep the 'village feel'.	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
8	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
8	11	1		Small plot, underused and near main road, inside 30 mph boundary.	Supportive of Policy 9.	Noted.	Noted.
8	12	1		Good plot and there are already flats there.	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
8	13	1		Already has houses with services on that road.	Supportive of Policy 11.	Noted.	Noted.
8	14	1		Using small plot next to other dwellings.	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
8	15	1		Small, neat plot with access road.	Supportive of Policy 13.	Noted.	Noted.
8	16	1		Already had pre-fabs there years ago, and has a road leading along the plot.	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.
8	17	1		Already had buildings on it plus road access.	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
8	18	1		Has access and lovely site for 2 dwellings.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.
9	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
9	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
9	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
9	4	1		To fit in with the village.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
9	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
9	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
9	11	1		Small plot, good for houses, inside 30 mph zone.	Supportive of Policy 9.	Noted.	Noted.
9	12	1		Good, opposite NP05	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
9	13	1		Good site.	Supportive of Policy 11.	Noted.	Noted.
9	14	1		Good site to fill-in.	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
9	15	1		Small area unused as farm land.	Supportive of Policy 13.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
9	16	1		Out of the way. Good road - Newall Drive.	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.
9	17	1		Good for houses- old chicken farm	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
9	18	1		Fill-in land - good for dwellings.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.
10	1	2		Believe it to be a good solution.	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.
10	2	2			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
10	3	2		It's important that the landscape remains as it is. High rise in the area would look awful.	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
10	4	2			Supportive of Policy 2.		
10	5	2		Probably the best solution to a difficult problem.	Supportive of Policy 3.	Noted.	Noted.
10	6	2			Supportive of Policy 4.		
10	7	2			Supportive of Policy 5.		
10	8	2		Would like to see the facilities enhanced, but they would need promoting to encourage people to use them.	Supportive of Policy 6.	Noted and agreed.	Noted.
10	9	2			Supportive of Policy 7.		
10	10	2		Anything that separates road traffic from people must be encouraged.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
10	11	2		Whilst I realise this land is needed, I don't want to see Mattersey extend its borders.	Policy 9 Concerns: Doesn't want to see Mattersey borders extended.	Understand concerns over village boundary extension, however the proposed site is inside the southern boundary of the Millennium Green on the opposite side of the road and within the 30 mph speed limit. In respect of this site, 77% (ie 51 out of 66) respondents voted in favour of some housing development on the site and the plan has been constructed to reflect the views of the majority.	Noted.
10	12	2			Supportive of Policy 10.		
10	13	2			Supportive of Policy 11.		
10	14	2			Supportive of Policy 12.		
10	15	2		On the proviso that the development maintains the character of the area.	Supportive of Policy 13.	The proposed site is within the Conservation Area and in close proximity to a listed building and heritage assets, therefore subject to strict governance over scale, design, appearance, materials and access, as required by the Conservation Office to ensure that "development is with minimal or no harm to the character and appearance of the setting of the listed building."	Noted.
10	16	2			Supportive of Policy 14.		
10	17	2			Supportive of Policy 15.		
10	18	2			Supportive of Policy 16.		
10	ADD	2		As an alternative, build houses on the Millenium Green and have an amenity area near the Bible College or adjacent to the school.	<u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Suggests a Millennium Green housing development	Options for this site were consulted upon as part of the plan. However, it was eventually removed from the final list of sites, due to the lack of progress with trying to establish whether the former landowners who donated the site, would require payment for a change of use, or possibly a share of sale proceeds, or even wish the site to revert to them if no longer suitable as a public open space. Plan (page 72) has been amended to include an additional Project 4, which states: "Millennium Green future usage to be examined"	Plan amended - Project 4 created.
11	1	1		Consider the vision to be a sensible, feasible and practicable for future growth of the Parish.	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
11	2	1		Objectives again are feasible and achievable.	Supportive of the Community Objectives.	Noted.	Noted.
11	3	1		There are many exceptional aspects within the Parish which should be protected	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
11	4	1		These appear to be with the character of the area/Parish and will complement existing properties.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
11	5	1		The proposed do not appear to create problems to existing properties/residents and this should be a requirement.	Supportive of Policy 3.	Noted.	Noted.
11	6	1		Heritage assets should be protected.	Supportive of Policy 4.	Noted.	Noted.
11	7	1		This will encourage and allow for a wider range of scope.	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
11	8	1		Current facilities are very limited.	Supportive of Policy 6.	Plan includes projects and a desire to retain and extend facilities.	Noted.
11	9	1		Very important for all residents to be able to access and enjoy.	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
11	10	1		Access for leisure and exercise should be available and encouraged.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
11	11	1		Have no specific objections. Lack of knowledge.	Supportive of Policy 9.	Noted.	Noted.
11	12	1		No obvious reasons to object to this.	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
11	13	1		No obvious reasons to object to this.	Supportive of Policy 11.	Noted.	Noted.
11	14	1		This should blend as a small development adjacent to existing properties.	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
11	15	1		Have no specific objections. Lack of knowledge.	Supportive of Policy 13.	Noted.	Noted.
11	16	1		Little or no problems will be caused to existing properties or residents.	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.
11	17	1		Allowing for road improvements. A good site for development. No apparent problems for existing properties or residents.	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
11	18	1		No obvious reasons for objections.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.
12	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
12	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
12	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
12	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
12	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
12	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
12	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
12	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
12	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
12	11	1	1		Not Supportive of Policy 9.		
12	12	1			Supportive of Policy 10.		
12	13	1			Supportive of Policy 11.		
12	14	1			Supportive of Policy 12.		
12	15	1			Supportive of Policy 13.		
12	16	1			Supportive of Policy 14.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
12	17	1	1	1.Outside any natural boundary. 2.It is a narrow busy lane. 3.Would this constitute a 'Green Belt' development ?	Policy 15 Concerns about village boundary extension Traffic levels. 'Green Belt' development ?	The site is outside of the current village boundary, but has been consulted upon with a majority of 59% of 76 respondents in favour of site development. Highways, as statutory consultees have responded that "Breck Lane is not of a sufficient standard to serve additional development. Further work would be required to improve highways issues." This would have to be addressed by a planning application proposal as a pre-condition of site development approval. The site would not be a 'Green Belt' development.	Noted.
12	18	1			Supportive of Policy 16.		
13	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
13	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
13	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
13	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
13	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
13	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
13	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
13	8	-	-	Not sufficient need for village hall as well as Church hall in Mattersey. Pubs were not supported when we had them. A village hall at Mattersey Thorpe would be a plus.	Policy 6: Did not declare whether for or against the policy. Unconvinced of the need for a village hall in Mattersey. Would like a village hall in Mattersey Thorpe.	The comment is correct in respect of pub closures. However, the 'Residents Survey' (on the M&MT website), reported that 78% of 180 respondents ranked recreational facilities as either important or very important. In the survey, residents also ranked a new shop or pub, as the highest in terms of what businesses they would like to see in the parish. Appendix A of the Plan includes a project to provide a new multi-use facility on the football club changing rooms site in Mattersey Thorpe.	Noted.
13	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
13	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
13	11	1			Supportive of Policy 9.		
13	12	1	1	To maintain peaceful area of cemetery is important. More buildings will produce more traffic	Policy 10 Concerns: Noise and traffic	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. This site had the approval of 59% of 75 of respondents, and is compliant with consultees comments. This site has been granted planning application approval for 4 dwellings of a similar type and layout as the properties across the road.	Noted.
13	13	1		With the proviso that trees and hedges are retained.	Policy 11 Concerns: Trees protection	The trees are subject to a 'Tree Preservation Order'. This site has been granted planning application approval for 7 dwellings. It requires an access road leading to the proposed dwellings, behind the existing trees and hedges.	Noted.
13	14	1		But query access ?	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
13	15	1			Supportive of Policy 13.		
13	16	1			Supportive of Policy 14.		
13	17	1			Supportive of Policy 15.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
				13	18	1	1
14	1	1	1		Supportive of the Vision.		
14	2	1	1		Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
14	3	1	1		Supportive of Policy 1.		
14	4	1	1		Supportive of Policy 2.		
14	5	1	1		Supportive of Policy 3.		
14	6	1	1		Supportive of Policy 4.		
14	7	1	1		Supportive of Policy 5.		
14	8	1	1		Supportive of Policy 6.		
14	9	1	1		Supportive of Policy 7.		
14	10	1	1		Supportive of Policy 8.		
14	11	1	1		Supportive of Policy 9.		
14	12	1	1		Supportive of Policy 10.		
14	13	1	1		Supportive of Policy 11.		
14	14	1	1		Supportive of Policy 12.		
14	15	1	1		Supportive of Policy 13.		
14	16	1	1		Supportive of Policy 14.		
14	17	1	1	OK - no objections.	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
14	18	1	1		Supportive of Policy 16.		
15	1	1	1		Supportive of the Vision.		
15	2	1	1		Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
15	3	1	1		Supportive of Policy 1.		
15	4	1	1		Supportive of Policy 2.		
15	5	1	1		Supportive of Policy 3.		
15	6	1	1		Supportive of Policy 4.		
15	7	1	1		Supportive of Policy 5.		
15	8	1	1		Supportive of Policy 6.		
15	9	1	1		Supportive of Policy 7.		
15	10	1	1		Supportive of Policy 8.		
15	11	1	1		Supportive of Policy 9.		
15	12	1	1		Supportive of Policy 10.		
15	13	1	1		Supportive of Policy 11.		
15	14	1	1		Supportive of Policy 12.		
15	15	1	1		Supportive of Policy 13.		
15	16	1	1		Supportive of Policy 14.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
15	17	1		I trust this will be the final number of properties on this site !	Policy 15: Querying number of houses.	The numbers are indicative with an assumption of mixed housing types. Therefore, the housing numbers are indicative for the plan, but would need to be made clear, (along with details of housing types, spacing, access, etc..) as part of a planning application proposal	Noted.
15	18		1	This land has already been the subject of planning application 17/01225/OUT and was refused after objections from neighbours. Why is this still a preferred option for the Neighbourhood Plan ? - Is there something we don't know ?	Policy 16 Concerns: Querying reason for site within the plan	This site plus an adjacent site formed part of planning application 17/01225/OUT which was refused permission by BDC. This specific site has been consulted upon at the community events and received the approval of 61% of the 43 residents responses.	Noted.
16	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
16	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
16	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
16	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
16	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
16	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
16	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
16	8	1			Supportive of Policy 6.		
16	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
16	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
16	11		1	We have enough big houses.	Policy 9 Concerns: Too many large houses	77% (ie 51 out of 66) respondents voted in favour of some housing development on the site. 84% (ie 43 out of the 51 in favour) wanted to see smaller houses with closer spacing. The plan has been constructed to reflect the views of the majority of respondents.	Noted.
16	12	1		Already passed.	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
16	13	1		Already passed.	Supportive of Policy 11.	Noted.	Noted.
16	14	1		Already passed.	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
16	15		1	The development would obstruct the farmer's gate to his field.	Policy 13 Concerns over farm access	Under planning rules, a planning application is unlikely to be approved where a development proposes to remove or restrict the existing access of those landowners bordering the site. It would also be subject to statutory and public consultation which gives objections from neighbours a strong weighting in respect of their existing rights of amenity and access.	Noted.
16	16	1		If it is for affordable housing.	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.
16	17	1		Only if Breck Lane is made into a proper road, it's not wide enough and full of potholes.	Policy 15 Concerns: Traffic and poor road condition.	Highways, as statutory consultees have responded that "Breck Lane is not of a sufficient standard to serve additional development. Further work would be required to improve highways issues." This would have to be addressed by a planning application proposal as a condition to site development approval.	Noted.
16	18	1		It's a small infill	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
16	ADD	1		The Parish Plan in 2005 state we must have more affordable houses. The Neighbourhood Plan only seems to encourage the opposite.	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Parish Plan 2005 vs NP in respect of affordable housing	Disagree with the contention that the Neighbourhood Plan does not encourage affordable houses! Objectives and Policies specifically emphasis this ie Community Objective 2 ie "To ensure that future housing development meets local need for smaller 2 to 3 bed market dwellings" This is further emphasised in Policy 3 ie "Proposals that include smaller dwellings on infill sites that are within a safe walking distance of local amenities will be encouraged.." Policy 5 states "Planning applications for housing schemes are required to deliver a housing mix that reflects the demonstrable need for smaller (2-3 bed) market dwellings..." The residents have been repeatedly consulted in respect of site location, housing type and site densities. The resulting plan includes the majority preferences as feedback by the respondents from those consultations.	Noted.
17	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
17	2	1		Youngsters and families improve community spirit and rec facilities. Maintain pre-school and primary school by better organisation - little ones to Mattersey, older ones to Everton etc..	Supportive of the Community Objectives.	Noted.	Noted.
17	3	1		Good walks between Everton and village - retain woodland and bridges.	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
17	4	1		Rural character houses - not great big 'exec' style houses.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
17	5	1		Smaller developments to infill.	Supportive of Policy 3.	Noted.	Noted.
17	6	1		Better public access for the Priory - older people in cars can not walk from village and back.	Policy 4: Suggests better public access to the Priory	The Priory is accessed via a bridleway, which prohibits the use of motor vehicles without permission from the landowner. The Plan contains a project with the aim of retaining or improving upon access to the Priory, particularly for those with restricted mobility.	Noted.
17	7	1		As discussed before - to encourage younger people to buy property within their price range.	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
17	8	1		We all miss the pub. Church Hall too small - Bigger hall between villages to support both ?	Supportive of Policy 6.	Noted.	Noted.
17	9	1		We need to be able to enjoy 'green' countryside in and around village.	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
17	10	1		Reopening of joining Carr Lane with Priory Lane to make a 'round. Linking track in Pusto woods to Sandstone Lane for a round (Eel Pool Road too dangerous).	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
17	11		1	6 too many. 2 or 3 houses better.	Policy 9 Concerns: Too many houses proposed.	77% (ie 51 out of 66) respondents voted in favour of some housing development on the site. 84% of those (ie 43 out of the 51 in favour) wanted to see smaller houses with closer spacing. The plan has been constructed to reflect the views of the majority of respondents.	Noted.
17	12	1		Providing they are bungalows / flats and in character with rural aspect.	Supportive of Policy 10.	This site has been granted planning application approval for 4 dwellings of a similar type and layout as the properties across the road.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
17	13	1	1	Infringing on open countryside.	Policy 11 Concerns: Infringing open countryside.	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. This site had approval of 51% of 73 respondents. This site has been granted planning application approval for 7 dwellings with an access road leading to the development, behind the existing trees and hedges. It has an eastern boundary which leads to the Bible College playing field and then onto open countryside.	Noted.
17	14	1	1	Providing they are bungalows / flats and in character with rural aspect.	Supportive of Policy 12.	This site has been granted planning application approval for 3 dwellings of a similar type and layout as existing properties on the same side of the road.	Noted.
17	15	1	1	But 4 smaller designs with separate access to fields for large ploughs, sprayers, etc..	Supportive of Policy 13.	The proposed site is within the Conservation Area and in close proximity to a listed building and heritage assets, therefore subject to strict governance over scale, design, appearance, materials and access, as required by the Conservation Office to ensure that "development is with minimal or no harm to the character and appearance of the setting of the listed building."	Noted.
17	16	1	1	Too near sewage farm.	Policy 14 Concerns: Proximity to sewage farm.	The site is on the edge of cultivated agricultural fields within a rural setting. Existing properties on the western edge of the site boundary are closer to the sewage farm, yet no related complaints have been raised with Parish Council.	Noted.
17	17	1	1	Yes, as long as in character and suitable for young families pricewise when designed and built.	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
17	18	1	1	Yes, as long as in character and suitable for young families pricewise when designed and built.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.
18	1	2	2		Not Supportive of the Vision - See Additional Comments		
18	2	2	2		Not Supportive of the Community Objectives - See Additional Comments.		
18	3	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 1 - See Additional Comments.		
18	4	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 2 - See Additional Comments.		
18	5	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 3 - See Additional Comments.		
18	6	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 4 - See Additional Comments.		
18	7	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 5 - See Additional Comments.		
18	8	2	2		Supportive of Policy 6.		
18	9	2	2		Supportive of Policy 7.		
18	10	2	2		Supportive of Policy 8.		
18	11	2	2		Supportive of Policy 9.		
18	12	2	2		Supportive of Policy 10.		
18	13	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 11 - See Additional Comments.		
18	14	2	2		Supportive of Policy 12.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
18	15		2		Not Supportive of Policy 13 - See Additional Comments.		
18	16		2		Not Supportive of Policy 14 - See Additional Comments.		
18	17		2		Not Supportive of Policy 15 - See Additional Comments.		
18	18		2		Not Supportive of Policy 16 - See Additional Comments.		
18	ADD	2		Having recently move to M. Thorpe 3 months ago. We did so for the wonderful views and countryside, which would be devastating if these were to be ruined by property developers lining their pockets, not giving a thought to all the wildlife. The village is a lovely place to live but doesn't have a lot to offer - no convenience store, no pub and the future of the PO looks bleak, it can be a very lonely place especially for the elderly. Parts of the village are on a flood plain which would make it ridiculous to build.	<u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Concerned about: Loss of rural views Lack of facilities Flooding risks.	Community Objective 3 states "To ensure that the design of new development reflects the rural nature of the parish." Policy 1 contains recommendations to "protect the landscape character of Mattersey parish." The Plan also includes 21 important viewpoints to be protected against development : Map 9a - Mattersey Thorpe: shows 7 key viewpoints to be protected. Map 9b - Mattersey village: shows 14 key viewpoints to be protected. The plan seeks to encourage the retention or expansion of existing facilities and the creation of new facilities. All sites have been subject to statutory consultation in respect of flood risks and drainage requirements on a site-by-site basis.	Noted.
19	1		2	My vision is that this lovely village stays just as it is.	Not supportive of Community Vision : Wants no development	Development proposals were generated by the community at an initial consultation event and then subjected to site assessment and statutory consultation. Non-developable sites were removed, or reduced in size, to meet with feedback comments / recommendation. The remaining sites were then consulted upon and feedback received from the community. The plan now contains only those sites which have received a clear majority of respondents in favour of these proposals.	Noted.
19	2		2	Villages like this are few and far between. People of my age (65) want to live in these pleasant surroundings. That's why we moved here 18 months ago.	Not Supportive of the Community Objectives.	The plan only contains sites where feedback from consultation events have shown a majority preference by residents in favour of development for that site.	Noted.
19	3	2		That is why I disagree with all this house building.	Supportive of Policy 1.	The plan only contains sites where feedback from consultation events have shown a majority preference by residents in favour of development for that site.	Noted.
19	4		2	No more housing !	Policy 2 Concerns: Rejects more housing outright	The plan only contains sites where feedback from consultation events have shown a majority preference by residents in favour of development for that site.	Noted.
19	5		2	You have ruined Everton. Do not do the same to Mattersey.	Policy 3 Concerns: Worried that scale of development in Everton would be repeated in Mattersey Parish	The plan for Mattersey parish has been compiled with the help of residents, based upon feedback from consultations and amended to reflect the majority views at each major stage of its development.	Noted.
19	6	2		We must keep our heritage.	Supportive of Policy 4.	Map 2 (p.12) shows Heritage and other key assets within the parish. Those assets designated as 'Positive' (ie important buildings) plus 'Non-Designated' assets are listed in Appendix F (p.112).	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
19	7		2	No more housing.	Policy 5 Concerns: Rejects more housing outright	The plan only contains sites where feedback from consultation events have shown a majority preference by residents in favour of development for that site.	Noted.
19	8	-	-	It would be nice to keep the Post Office and store, but definitely NO PUB ! The village had 2 pubs in the past, they both had to close, as have many in the country. If people want a drink they can walk to Everton only one mile away. Pubs can attract anti-social behavior and would increase traffic on these narrow roads.	Did not declare whether for or against Policy 6. Supports the PO and store, but does not support a new pub.	The comment is correct in respect of pub closures. However, the 'Residents Survey' (on the M&MT website), reported that 78% of 180 respondents ranked recreational facilities as either important or very important. In the survey, residents also ranked a new shop or pub, as the highest in terms of what businesses they would like to see in the parish.	Noted.
19	9	2		People need these spaces for recreation and well being.	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
19	10	2		The less traffic the better - more cyclepaths and footpaths.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
19	11		2	You are, in effect, extending the village boundary towards Ranskill Road where traffic enter at 60-70 mph. Dangerous !	Policy 9: Concerns over traffic speeds. Extending the village boundary	Recognise traffic speeds as an ongoing issue, but the site is within 30 mph speed limit. Notts Highways recommended 2-metre kerbed footway across the site frontage plus an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing to the Millennium Green. No concerns were raised in respect of traffic approaching to the site during the site assessment stage. A future development proposal would also be subject to a planning application, where the specific site proposals relating to entering and leaving the site, plus off-road parking and 'line of sight' concerns would be subject to statutory consultation with Highways and residents. The proposed site is inside the roadside boundary of the Millennium Green on the opposite side of the road.	Noted.
19	12		2	This road regularly floods up to the flat doorsteps. It is on the edge of a flood plain.	Policy 10:Concerns over site flooding.	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. This site had the approval of 59% of 75 of respondents, and is compliant with consultees comments. The site is outside of the flood zone. The approved planning application makes specific conditions relating to onsite drainage and highways drainage improvements to mitigate against flooding.	Noted.
19	13		2	No more housing. It isn't needed	Policy 11 Concerns: Rejects more housing outright	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. This site had approval of 51% of 73 respondents. This site has been granted planning application approval for 7 dwellings with an access road leading to the development, behind the existing trees and hedges.	Noted.
19	14		2	We need a break between Mattersey and Thorpe. This will, I fear, be eroded away.	Policy 12: Concerns over infill between Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe	A 'Settlement Break' is created by the plan which prohibits further encroachment between the two settlements over the course of the plan. This site has been granted planning application approval for 3 dwellings of a similar type and layout as existing properties on the same side of the road.	Noted.
19	15		2	More vehicular traffic is undesirable.	Policy 13: Concerns over traffic levels.	Noted.	Noted.
19	16		2	No more housing. No more traffic !	Policy 14: Concerns over traffic	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. This site had the approval of 67% of 69 respondents. Connecting roads would have to be improved to an adoptable standard, in order to meet with Highways requirements.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
19	17		2	This will impede the views of the open countryside. The narrow potholed road of Breck Lane is unsuitable to take any further vehicular traffic.	Policy 15: Concerns about loss of view, Traffic levels and poor road conditions	The site has been consulted upon with a majority of 59% of 76 respondents in favour of site development. Highways, as statutory consultees have responded that "Breck Lane is not of a sufficient standard to serve additional development. Further work would be required to improve highways issues." This would have to be addressed by a planning application proposal as a condition to site development approval.	Noted.
19	18		2	This will impede the views of the open countryside. The narrow potholed road of Breck Lane is unsuitable to take any further vehicular traffic.	Policy 16 Concerns : Impeding of countryside views Traffic levels and poor road condition.	Maps 9a (on p.28) and 9b (p.29) shows 21 key views to be protected within the parish. This site had the approval of 61% of 43 respondents. Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. Highways response is still awaited. Site access onto the public roads would most likely be via a privately maintained road. It seems unlikely that an additional 2 dwellings would have a significant impact upon traffic levels.	Noted.
20	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
20	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
20	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
20	4	1			Supportive of Policy 2.		
20	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
20	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
20	7	1			Supportive of Policy 5.		
20	8	1		Replace Mattersey Thorpe football club building with a multi-purpose community centre.	Supportive of Policy 6.	Appendix A of the Plan does include a project to provide a new multi-use facility on the football club changing rooms site in Mattersey Thorpe.	Noted.
20	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
20	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
20	11	1			Supportive of Policy 9.		
20	12	1			Supportive of Policy 10.		
20	13	1			Supportive of Policy 11.		
20	14	1			Supportive of Policy 12.		
20	15	1		So long as these are small dwellings	Supportive of Policy 13.	The proposed site is within the Conservation Area and in close proximity to a listed building and heritage assets, therefore subject to strict governance over scale, design, appearance, materials and access, as required by the Conservation Office to ensure that "development is with minimal or no harm to the character and appearance of the setting of the listed building."	Noted.
20	16	1			Supportive of Policy 14.		
20	17	1			Supportive of Policy 15.		
20	18	1			Supportive of Policy 16.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
21	1	2		We believe more prominence should be given to the importance of the various local businesses which operate within the Parish. This distinguishes the village from many others and the existing brief mentions of 'work' do not do justice to this.	Supportive of the Vision, but would like businesses to be more prominent within the plan.	As part of the plan preparation, businesses were surveyed as to their current/future needs and requirements within the Parish, which formed part of the plan compilation. However, this is primarily a housing development plan, which aims to protect the rural character and environment, while improving facilities and services as part of developing the sites chosen by the community.	Noted.
21	2	2		The employment objective here needs to reflect the above : the current problems facing the shop and Post Office are a reminder of how suddenly a local business can face a threat to its existence.	Supportive of the Community Objectives.	The plan policies emphasise the need to retain and expand facilities where possible to try to match the existing and future needs of the community..	Noted.
21	3	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
21	4	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
21	5	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 3.	Noted.	Noted.
21	6	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 4.	Noted.	Noted.
21	7	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
21	8	2		Reference to provision of a pub seems unrealistic, given that we have lost all 3 since we moved here 40 years ago. The reference to a community building in Mattersey Thorpe suggests that the 2 settlements will operate separately. When the original Village/Church Hall (the MaltKiln building) existed, it was extensively used by all. We suggest that the focus should be on rediscovering the overall community spirit, possibly by having the ambition to create an adequate community space for all - difficult though it would be.	Policy 6 Concerns: Provision of new pub is unrealistic. A new community building in Mattersey Thorpe suggests separation of settlements.	The comment is correct in respect of pub closures. However, the 'Residents Survey' (on the M&MT website), reported that 78% of 180 respondents ranked recreational facilities as either important or very important. In the survey, residents also ranked a new shop or pub, as the highest in terms of which businesses they would like to see in the parish. Appendix A of the Plan does include a project to provide a new multi-use facility on the football club changing rooms site in Mattersey Thorpe. However it is intended that this would provide recreational activities available for use by both settlements, in the same way that existing facilities are.	Noted.
21	9	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
21	10	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
21	11	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 9.	Noted.	Noted.
21	12	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
21	13	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 11.	Noted.	Noted.
21	14	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 12.	Noted.	Noted.
21	15	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 13.	Noted.	Noted.
21	16	2		Generally agree	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
21	17		2	<p>The current redevelopment of Manor Farm's outbuildings is very welcome, but we are opposed to site NP14 as follows:</p> <p>1. Described as 'on the Manor Farm site' suggesting where the former farm buildings used to stand. In fact, the majority of the site is greenfield land albeit containing 2 former chicken sheds placed there about 20 years ago. Crops are grown around these sheds.</p> <p>2. The effect would be to extend the built environment well down Breck Lane. This land has never previously contained bricks and mortar structures and presumably the placing of the chicken sheds was done under agricultural permission.</p> <p>3. 11 dwellings would be entirely at odds with the character of the original Thorpe hamlet. A large modern development along one side of Breck Lane would stand out like a sore thumb and this seems to conflict with the first part of Policy 1</p> <p>4. Breck Lane itself is narrow, difficult to drive along and in its present state, incapable of accommodating yet more traffic.</p>	<p>Policy 15: Opposed to the development.</p> <p>Greenfield land containing former chicken sheds</p> <p>Extending the built environment</p> <p>Housing quantity vs Policy 1</p> <p>Traffic levels and poor road condition</p>	<p>The site would not be 'Green Belt' development. The chicken sheds were built under a full planning permission.</p> <p>The site is outside of the current village boundary, but has been consulted upon with a majority of 59% of 76 respondents in favour of site development.</p> <p>71% (ie 32 out of 45) of the respondents in favour of site development wanted to see mixed housing types to allow for smaller, medium and larger houses. 11 dwellings is indicative of those mixed housing types. The actual housing numbers would need to be made clear, (along with details of housing types, spacing, access, etc..) as part of a planning application proposal, which would be subject to statutory and residents consultation.</p> <p>Highways, as statutory consultees have responded that "Breck Lane is not of a sufficient standard to serve additional development. Further work would be required to improve highways issues." This would have to be addressed by a planning application proposal as a condition to site development approval.</p>	Noted.
21	18		2		Supportive of Policy 16.		
22	3			<p>Policy 1. Why is the break between M & MT considered to be a key open space? It seems to be private land without public access and the emphasis on keeping the "settlements" apart seems to emphasise segregation rather than trying to create unity between the two.</p>	<p>Did not declare whether for or against Policy 1.</p> <p>Queries the retention of the settlement gap.</p>	<p>The residents survey showed that 83% of 191 respondents wanted the space between the two settlement to be retained. Steering Group believes that the settlement break within the plan reflects the wishes of that significant majority.</p>	Noted.
22	7			<p>In general, what influence/ control does this plan have over the type of housing that is actually erected on the approved sites? ie How many properties on a particular site and what size/affordability for local families? How many of 2-bed dwellings are intended ?</p>	<p>Did not declare whether for or against Policy 5. Queries its effectiveness</p> <p>Wants site-specific details of housing types.</p>	<p>This policy aims to set the mix of housing within proposed developments to match the needs for family housing (2-3 bed) across the parish.</p> <p>Site-specific housing mix will be assessed against this policy when considering each proposal arising from a planning application.</p>	Noted.
22	9			<p>Policy 7. Why is the Millennium Green not listed as a Local Green Space? There was, from memory, a suggestion to sell MG for housing and create a new play facility on Bible College land on Retford Road. This site (NP09) has now been approved for building, but nothing seemingly done to protect the only open space that remains in Mattersey.</p>	<p>Did not declare whether for or against Policy 7.</p> <p>Has concerns over the future of the Millennium Green</p>	<p>Millennium Green (MG) is not listed as a green space, because it is already registered and protected under a 'Deed of Trust', which requires any proposed changes to be justified in accordance with those deeds, prior to applying for permission from the Charities Commission.</p>	Noted.
22	10			<p>Policy 8. Apart from being idealistic, what non-vehicular routes, especially along River Idle are proposed/ been requested ? [The bridleways that run up the hill towards Everton/Harwell opposite Eel Pool Road, were converted to "By-ways" some years ago and are now frequently used by trail bikers and 4x4 owners looking for off-road experiences, especially at speed. Detracts from use by others.)</p>	<p>Did not declare whether for or against Policy 8.</p> <p>Queried what proposals for non-vehicular routes were in the plan.</p>	<p>Policy 8 is an enabling policy to provide a basis for assessing developments, should they arise over the course of the plan.</p> <p>There are no specific proposal for routes within the plan, but it was felt that without an enabling policy in the plan, then there never would be.</p>	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
				22	11		
22	15			Page 60-61 of Draft Plan refers to development at Laurels Farm and consideration for planning permission being granted. While it has already been stated at the last open day that 2 parking spaces per development is a standard BDC requirement for new development, I believe more parking is required to avoid overflow/guest parking onto Main Street, which is already a safety hazard to residents trying to exit their properties. I would like to see a caveat in the Policy 13 conditions that more spacing than this is required eg "Communal overflow spacings for all residents of that development to utilise as and when required." The plan describes the land as "East of Main Street". - It is in fact located to the West.	Did not declare whether for or against Policy 13: Concerns over insufficient onsite parking giving rise to overspill parking on Main Street.	The proposed site is within the Conservation Area and in close proximity to a listed building and heritage assets, therefore subject to strict governance over scale, design, appearance, materials and access within the setting of a listed building. BDC onsite parking is dependent upon the size of property and number of bedrooms, but requires provision for a minimum of 2-cars, plus facility for vehicle turning on-plot where necessary, to prevent reversing onto highways A proposed development would also be subject to statutory and public consultation, giving neighbours comments a strong weighting in respect of their existing rights of amenity, onsite parking, site access/egress.	Noted.
22	ADD			Local Green Space (P.48 of Draft Plan). As Millennium Green has been designated a "local green space" according to para 142, page 57, What may affect the long term viability of the space and why might the Parish Council reconsider it ? Is the "Green Space" designation meaningless in terms of the protection it offers ? What can be done to ensure sufficient off-road car parking is provided for all the named developments ? Most families have at least 2 vehicles these days, often more.	<u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Concerns relating to Millennium Green Off-road parking for development sites	Plan has been amended, as a result of comments received, in that the Millennium Green will no longer seek designation as a 'Local Green Space' primarily because it is already registered and protected under a 'Deed of Trust' requiring justification and permission from the Charities Commission prior to any change as to the site status or location. The Plan (page 72) has been amended to include an additional Project 4, which states: "Millennium Green future usage to be examined" in order not to prevent options from being discussed and/or developed should the residents wish it at some point during the plan. Off-road parking would be dealt with on a site-specific basis under a planning application proposal with the involvement of statutory consultees (including Highways) and residents.	Section 18 reference to the Millennium Green as a potential "Local green Space" has been removed. Project 4 has been created to allow it's future usage to be examined.
23	1	1		Agree in principle, but can't see it working.	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.
23	2		1	The village is not supported by Transport links and Council Facilities to support extra housing.	Not Supportive of the Community Objectives due to Inadequate Transport links Inadequate Council facilities.	The village is served by a regular bus service and close to major road networks. The potential impact upon facilities have been assessed by statutory consultees on a site-by-site basis as part of the site selection process. Sites have been removed where issues existed. The proposed sites in the plan have passed that test. Steering Group considers that the overall type and number of proposed dwellings do not represent an undue burden upon facilities provided to the parish.	Noted.
23	3	1		Keep our villages green.	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
23	4	1		Except the plan on Newall Drive because of flooding.	Supportive of Policy 2.	The size of the originally proposed site on Newall Drive was reduced following statutory consultees concerns regarding flood zone risks, during the site assessment stage. The proposed site was reduced accordingly. The site boundary now sits entirely outside of the Flood Zone .	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
23	5	1			Supportive of Policy 3.		
23	6	1			Supportive of Policy 4.		
23	7	1		Depending on the mix!	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
23	8	1	1	Community buildings will not work as we have found in the past, and pubs will not be supported.	Policy 6: Does not believe new facilities would be supported.	Tthe residents survey has shown a desire for better facilities. The plan takes a more optimistic view as to the usage of new facilities.	Noted.
23	9	1			Supportive of Policy 7.		
23	10	1			Supportive of Policy 8.		
23	11	1			Supportive of Policy 9.		
23	12	1			Supportive of Policy 10.		
23	13	1			Supportive of Policy 11.		
23	14	1			Supportive of Policy 12.		
23	15	1			Supportive of Policy 13.		
23	16	1	1	The land at the back of Newall Drive is prone to flooding.	Policy 14: Concerns over flooding	The proposed site is outside of the Flood Zone. Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. Drainage officers commented that soakaways should be effective in draining the site, but that Greenfield run-off rates would have to be maintained as part of any development.	Noted.
23	17	1		Looks better.	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
23	18	1			Supportive of Policy 16.		
24	1	2		It seems, in general, to preserve the nature and charcter of the village.	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.
24	2	2		It seems, in general, to preserve the nature and charcter of the village. However, I think, Objective 1 is unrealistic, very few primary age children will be generated by the suggested proposals and school numbers being so low make it unattractive to many parents.	Supportive of the Community Objectives.	Noted.	Noted.
24	3	2		The settlement break is important.	Supportive of Policy 1.	Noted.	Noted.
24	4	2		Housing developments should be symnpathetic and in-keeping with the existing character.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
24	5	2		Good quality infill and redevelopment should be encouraged where possible.	Supportive of Policy 3.	Noted.	Noted.
24	6	2		Preservation of the character of the village within the conservation area is important.	Supportive of Policy 4.	Noted.	Noted.
24	7	2		Whilst a mix of housing should be maintained, any developments should be sympathetic to neighbouring properties, not driven by a "quota" for certain housing types.	Policy 5: Argues against a quota for housing types.	No quota exists since Bassetlaw doesn't currently have a 5-year housing plan, although one is expected to have been completed by 2021. Housing types are based on an assessment of need evidenced in the "Housing Needs Assessment" report (on the M&MT website).	Noted.
24	8	2		Demonstrable need is important, not the feelings of some (a minority) that it might be a good idea. Just because other villages have different facilities, it does not mean that Mattersey / Thorpe has to follow.	Supportive of Policy 6.	The 'Residents Survey' (on the M&MT website), reported that 78% of 180 respondents ranked recreational facilities as either important or very important. In the survey, residents also ranked a new shop or pub, as the highest in terms of what businesses they would like to see in the parish. These both appear to demonstrate that there is a need.	Noted.
24	9	2			Supportive of Policy 7.		
24	10	2		More non-vehicular routes, particularly of a circular nature would benefit the whole parish. Mattersey lacks these types of 'rights of way'.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
24	11		2	This is an extension of the village curtilage and is adjacent to no other houses. It would follow no building line.	Policy 9: Concerns over extending the village boundary	The proposed site is inside the 30 mph limit and within the roadside boundary set by the Millennium Green on the opposite side of the road. 77% (ie 51 out of 66) respondents voted in favour of some housing development on the site. 84% (ie 43 out of the 51 in favour) wanted to see smaller houses with closer spacing. The plan has been constructed to reflect the views of the majority of respondents.	Noted.
24	12		2	Again an extension of the village curtilage.	Policy 10 Concerns: Settlement boundary extension	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. This site had the approval of 59% of 75 of respondents, and is compliant with consultees comments. This site mirrors the roadside developments up to the cemetery on the opposite side of Thorpe Road and has been granted planning application approval for 4 dwellings of a similar type and layout as those properties.	Noted.
24	13	2		We would consider this infill as it is opposite existing houses and maintains an existing building line.	Supportive of Policy 11.	Noted.	Noted.
24	14		2	Again an extension of the village curtilage, though more logical than NP04.	Policy 12 Concerns: Settlement boundary extension	A 'Settlement Break' is created by the plan which prohibits further encroachment between the two settlements over the course of the plan. This site has been granted planning application approval for 3 dwellings of a similar type and layout as existing properties on the same side of the road.	Noted.
24	15	2		Barn conversions would be in-keeping with village character.	Supportive of Policy 13.	Noted.	Noted.
24	16	2		Reasons as for NP09 ie maintains an existing building line.	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.
24	17		2	Extending the village. Traffic going out onto already poor Breck Lane / Ranskill Road junction. No nearby facilities for residents.	Policy 15: Concerned about Village boundary extension Traffic levels Lack of nearby facilities	The site is outside of the current village boundary, but has been consulted upon with a majority of 59% of 76 respondents in favour of site development. Highways, as statutory consultees have responded that "Breck Lane is not of a sufficient standard to serve additional development. Further work would be required to improve highways issues." This would have to be addressed by a planning application proposal as a condition to site development approval. Mattersey Thorpe residents have good recreational facilities (the 'Green', childrens play park, open playing fields and a community house) and also make good use of Mattersey school and Post Office/shop.	Noted.
24	18	2		Infill.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.
25	1	1		It's a positive statement, and one that most rural communities would aspire to.	Supportive of the Vision.	Noted.	Noted.
25	2	1		Young people are essential, not just to grow a community, but to maintain it. The objectives are all positive, but I don't see how they are to be fulfilled.	Supportive of the Community Objectives.	The community will have to work together to make the most of development opportunities within the plan and beyond.	Noted.
25	3		1	What is visual intrusion? Look at developments eg Hall View with 26 houses, that must have been an intrusion 40 years ago. In order to create a vibrant community, change is necessary, the only thing that is constant is change, it just needs to be managed well.	Policy 3: Queries 'visual intrusion' as a constraint on development.	The plan is built upon the communities support for housing growth, but also recognises that the community also wishes to retain the rural character of the village and protect cherished views.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
25	4		1	I don't think there is a distinctiveness to the villages in terms of buildings, the array of styles is what makes the villages interesting. I do agree with maintaining quality.	Not Supportive of Policy 2. Challenges the notion of 'distinctiveness' for design	Plan includes design principles which have been consulted upon and accepted by the majority of respondents.	Noted.
25	5		1	I don't like the phrase "will only be", this sounds as if a barrier is already in place. I'm not sure if most of the community are aware of the conservation area. Can the statement be more positive? The principle is good.	Policy 3: Specific suggestion to make the policy more positive.	Plan amended to reflect comments by removing the word "only" from the policy.	Policy 3 amended.
25	6		1	Simply, I'm not sure I understand what is being said. Do we want developments or not? Would ordinary planning regulations not support this statement ? Again it says "Will only"	Policy 4 Questions the need for the policy. Would like the policy to be more positive.	Planning regulations would enforce statutory protection where there is a clear breach. The plan aims to reinforce that by ensuring that heritage and non-designated assets are both listed and thereby subjected to the same planning constraints over the life of the plan. The policy has been amended to make more positive by removing the word "only"	Policy 4 amended.
25	7		1	Mixed housing types are always better as they attract a greater range of buyers. Where is the demonstrable need for 2-beds identified ?	Policy 5: Queries the evidence base for 2-bed houses.	Plan document - Table 6 (Page 46) shows an extract of recommendations on 2-3 bed housing types resulting from a "Housing Needs Assessment" (on the M&MT website) for the parish and in the wider context of Bassettlaw, undertaken by AECOM as part of the plan compilation.	Noted.
25	8		1	Please enhance what we already have eg the Millennium Green, but how do we demonstrate the need for a pub when we have lost two? It is important to have continued support for what we already have.	Policy 6: Not convinced of a need for a pub, given past closures. Would like to see existing facilities - Millennium Green enhanced.	The comment is correct in respect of pub closures. However, the 'Residents Survey' (on the M&MT website), reported that 78% of 180 respondents ranked recreational facilities as either important or very important. In the survey, residents also ranked a new shop or pub, as the highest in terms of which businesses they would like to see in the parish. Appendix A of the Plan includes a project to examine the future usage of the Millennium Green(MG). During the formulation of this plan, there was a general dissatisfaction of residents with the current MG location and facilities. Options for the enhancement or relocation of MG were considered, but progress could not be made as to the likely response of the former landowner to those options.	Noted.
25	9		1	Green spaces are important, but again need to be supported and enhanced.	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
25	10		1	Just the last paragraph sounds so negative, yet the policy is good.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.
25	11		1	We need more housing to improve the villages by bringing in revenue and creating the need for facilities.	Supportive of Policy 9.	Noted.	Noted.
25	12		1	Would support more housing.	Supportive of Policy 10.	Noted.	Noted.
25	13		1	Only 7 ?	Policy 11: Queries the number of houses	This site has been granted planning application approval for 7 dwellings with an access road leading to the development, behind the existing trees and hedges.	Noted.
25	14		1	We need new houses, 3 isn't enough.	Policy 12: Would like more housing	This site has been granted planning application approval for 3 dwellings of a similar type and layout as existing properties on the same side of the road.	Noted.
25	15		1	This should have been developed a long time ago.	Supportive of Policy 13.	Noted.	Noted.
25	16		1		Supportive of Policy 14.		
25	17		1	Will this impact on Mattersey or Mattersey Thorpe in terms of community ?	Supportive of Policy 15.	The plan presumes that additional housing will be a positive stimulus for both settlements. It is hoped that additional family houses in the parish would provide a much needed boost to pupil numbers at Mattersey school and an opportunity to involve more people at more village events.	Noted.
25	18		1	We need development.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
25	ADD	1		The overall aim is excellent, however I don't believe 45 new dwellings scattered across the villages, will allow this to be achieved. There needs to be a larger development in Mathersey, at least as big as Hall View. There seems to be an assumption that when people downsize, they go to much smaller properties, - thought should be given to larger properties with less rooms, downsizing doesn't have to mean the loss of a sizable kitchen for example. I really think that such small developments may just remain that, where two or three people who may know each other as neighbours, but go to work etc.. and simply live here rather than being part of the community. I know all too well, that people are always scared of change. I think everyone agrees the communities need to be enhanced, I'm not sure that this plan is strong enough to achieve this. A huge "Thank You" to everyone involved in this plan, without your commitment we wouldn't even be at square one. People are at least, now talking.	<u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Concerned that the Plan does not include sufficient housing development.	Over the past 2 years there have been 5 consultation events, from which an initial suggestion of 23 sites put forward by residents have been subjected to site assessment, statutory consultee and residents feedback. All sites that have been put forward have been evaluated. Some sites have been removed or reduced in size, following concerns highlighted by consultees. The net effect is that 8 sites have gone forward into the plan, giving a possibility of 45 new dwellings added to the community. Options for the Millennium Green(MG) were given considerable time and effort within the Steering group. The MG site was donated to the Millennium Trust for the recreational use of the community. However, it was eventually removed from the final list of sites, due to the lack of progress with trying to establish whether the former landowners who donated the site, would require payment for a change of use, or possibly a share of sale proceeds, or even wish the site to revert to them if no longer suitable as a public open space.	Project 4 has been created to allow Millennium Green's future usage to be examined.
26	1	1			Supportive of the Vision.		
26	2	1			Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
26	3	1			Supportive of Policy 1.		
26	4	1		Totally support this view. This can only enhance the area.	Supportive of Policy 2.	Noted.	Noted.
26	5		1	No development of any area of conservation. Developers will bend any rule and regulations to the max to obtain maximum profit.	Policy 3: Does not believe the regulations are sufficient to protect a conservation area.	Residents, Conservation Officers, Highways, and other statutory consultees were consulted during the site assessment stage. Steering Group has ensured that adverse feedback relating to a particular site was used to remove or amend site proposals. The plan only contains sites that have the approval of a majority of respondents, and are compliant with consultees comments, or would necessarily be made compliant with mitigation strategies, as part of a planning application proposal.	Noted.
26	6		1	No development of any area of conservation. Developers will bend any rule and regulations to the max to obtain maximum profit.	Policy 4: Does not believe the regulations are sufficient to protect a conservation area.	Conservation Officers, amongst others, were statutory consultees during the site assessment stage. Steering Group has ensured that adverse feedback relating to a particular site was used to remove or amend site proposals. The plan only contains sites that are compliant with consultees comments, or would need to be made compliant with mitigation strategies, in accordance with consultees comments, as part of a planning application proposal.	Noted.
26	7	1		But again not to build redbrick boxes in rows with no thought to design, dustbin placements, parking, etc..	Supportive of Policy 5.	Noted.	Noted.
26	8	1		Yes, it's always good to develop this type of improvement.	Supportive of Policy 6.	Noted.	Noted.
26	9	1		The spaces we have are very good. If you want to see a developers interpretation of open space, just go to the new development at Gringley-on-the-Hill - what a joke !	Supportive of Policy 7.	Noted.	Noted.
26	10	1		I like the slow pace of life along these routes.	Supportive of Policy 8.	Noted.	Noted.

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
26	11	1	1	The access road at this point would quickly become an accident black spot. As we all know, traffic is very fast at this point.	Policy 9: Concerns over traffic speeds.	Recognise traffic speeds as an ongoing issue, but the site is within 30 mph speed limit. Notts Highways recommended a 2-metre kerbed footway across the site frontage plus an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing to the Millennium Green. No concerns were received from Notts Highways in respect of traffic approaching the site during the site assessment stage. A future development proposal would also be subject to a planning application, wherein the specific site proposals relating to entering and leaving the site, plus off-road parking and 'line of sight' concerns would be subject to statutory consultation with Highways and residents.	Noted.
26	12	1	1	If it leaves a gap between the current buildings.	Policy 10: Concerns over house spacing.	This site has been granted planning application approval for 4 dwellings of a similar type and layout as the properties across the road.	Noted.
26	13	1	1	There exists a line of trees there, are they safe ?	Policy 11: Concerns over trees continued protection	The trees are subject to a 'Tree Preservation Order'. This site has been granted planning application approval for 7 dwellings with an access road leading to the development, behind the existing trees and hedges.	Noted.
26	14	1	1	On the proviso that these buildings are tagged onto the current line of building (No gaps)	Policy 12: Concerns over building placement	This site has been granted planning application approval for 3 dwellings of a similar type, spacing and roadside frontage as existing properties on the same side of the road.	Noted.
26	15	1	1	Only if the building is tightly controlled to completely blend-in with the current buildings.	Supportive of Policy 13.	The proposed site is within the Conservation Area and in close proximity to a listed building and heritage assets, therefore subject to strict governance over scale, design, appearance, materials and access, as required by the Conservation Office to ensure that "development is with minimal or no harm to the character and appearance of the setting of the listed building."	Noted.
26	16	1	1	Do not live in this area, so I don't have the right to influence building here.	Supportive of Policy 14.	Noted.	Noted.
26	17	1	1	Do not live in this area, so I don't have the right to influence building here.	Supportive of Policy 15.	Noted.	Noted.
26	18	1	1	Do not live in this area, so I don't have the right to influence building here.	Supportive of Policy 16.	Noted.	Noted.
27	1	2	2		Supportive of the Vision.		
27	2	2	2		Supportive of the Community Objectives.		
27	3	2	2		Supportive of Policy 1.		
27	4	2	2		Supportive of Policy 2.		
27	5	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 3 but gave no reasons as to why.		
27	6	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 4 but gave no reasons as to why.		
27	7	2	2		Supportive of Policy 5.		
27	8	2	2		Supportive of Policy 6.		
27	9	2	2		Supportive of Policy 7.		
27	10	2	2		Supportive of Policy 8.		
27	11	-	-		Did not declare whether supportive of Policy 9 or not.		
27	12	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 10 but gave no reasons as to why.		
27	13	2	2		Supportive of Policy 11.		
27	14	2	2		Supportive of Policy 12.		

COMPLETED FORM NO.	FEEDBACK FORM QUESTION NO.	YES - SUPPORTIVE	NO - NOT SUPPORTIVE	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK : RESIDENTS COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF RESIDENTS FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
27	15	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 13 but gave no reasons as to why.		
27	16	2			Supportive of Policy 14.		
27	17	2			Supportive of Policy 15.		
27	18	2	2		Not Supportive of Policy 16 but gave no reasons as to why.		
27	ADD	2		General: Planning permission on NP14, NP05 and NP04 has already been granted. What's the point in objecting to these sites through this process?	<p><u>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:</u> Queries why sites NP14, NP04 and NP05 are in the plan.</p>	<p>Generally, sites have been included in the plan after successfully passing through a site-assessment process, plus the majority approval of residents via consultation feedback.</p> <p>Site NP14 has not been the subject of a planning application, although planning approval has been given to barn conversions on an adjacent site. NP14 received approval of 59% of 76 respondents and so it is in the plan.</p> <p>Site NP04 has received planning approval within a limit of 3 years, but development has not yet started. It is in the plan for 3 main reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development discussions were stimulated by the Neighbourhood Planning process, and 2. It received consultation feedback approval of 59% of 75 respondents, and 3. As a precautionary basis in case development misses the planning approval deadline, thus creating a need to reapply for planning approval. <p>Site NP05 is in the plan for 3 main reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development discussions were stimulated by the Neighbourhood Planning process, and a planning application ensued, and 2. It received consultation feedback approval during the plan compilation, and 	Noted.