

## Appendix C3

### Hanslope Neighbourhood Revisions 2023-24 Public Consultation Events – October/November 2023

#### Comments and Feedback

20 comments received – 2 unusable as not relevant to neighbourhood plan: -

	Comment	SG response
1	Re: 'views' felt that references to and policies re. 'views' should acknowledge that views go in both directions.	<i>Agree</i>
2	Policy HAN 7 – Community Facilities: Re. Doctors surgery - could this section explain that this policy would “encourage and support” the improvements to the viability of a community facility. Whether or not the council has powers.	<i>SG discussed this and have reworded HAN7 §5.1 to reflect this</i>
3	Agrees with 1b 'Key Views'. Agrees with 2 – Hanslope 'Gap'. Agrees with 3a – existing open green spaces and feels this is important. Agrees with 3b – new green areas to be adopted. Agrees with 4 – applying existing policies to large developments.	
4	Fully supports the proposed amendments to the HNP.	
5	Supports the proposed amendments to the HNP.	
6	States that the owner of the farm between the Wheatfields Estate and Long Street (The 'Gap') is waiting for the right offer from developers and will then sell his farm for development. This would potentially lose 'The Gap'.	<i>See comment 12 response</i>
7	Offer to help on the steering committee.	<i>Thanks and SG will contact with details of next meeting</i>
8	Policy 1b update to include recommendation that the school playing fields are not in the NP settlement existing policy.	
9	Need to add 'new' houses and houses on Forest Road into the settlement of Long Street boundary.	<i>This is protected by the existing settlement boundary and would not be changed until full review of NP 2024-25.</i>
10	View from Castlethorpe Road through to the church.	<i>This is already on the plan</i>
11	Need to add 'views' into Long Street NP area.	<i>In the NP area but not in settlement</i>

12	Owner of land adjacent to 'The Gap': Objects to steering group imposing a planning policy on their land to preserve the gap between Long Street and Hanslope. Argues that there is now no important 'Gap' due to the building of the Wheatfields estate. Feels they are being told what they can and cannot do with their own land. Objects to the proposed policy as a landowner, as it constrains the use of their land.	<i>SG to respond stating that the Plan/SG has no power to 'impose' planning policy</i>
13	Feels we are well equipped as a village with good amenities including Village Hall, Community Hall, Recreation Ground, MUGA, keep fit equipment, and open spaces on new developments. Proactive churches and other groups arranging events. Further housing should be limited, as infrastructure cannot cope with major developments. Main concern is the Dr's Surgery.	<i>This comment will be noted whenever there are new planning applications/appeals</i>
14	A particular concern from the parish survey was that both excellent medical services provided through the existing medical practice should be maintained, as should the excellence of the village school.	<i>The NP will endeavor to support the maintenance and improvement of the medical and education services in the Parish</i>
15	Pleased to see open spaces on the Hanslope Fields estate are to be protected e.g. Oak tree and surrounding space. No mention however of green space to southwest of the school MUGA, running behind Hanslope Fields estate. This significant green area should be for all residents and should be included in the updated plan.	<i>The green space running behind the estate is already designated in the existing NP Policy HAN8 on p22 as "The proposed new managed 'wild area' at the bottom of the proposed Castlethorpe Road development bordering Green End Lane." and is detailed in §5.28.</i>
16	Fully agrees with the proposed amendments and in particular, the importance of retaining the separation between Hanslope and Long Street. SG thanked for their work.	
17	Why is the view looking towards Stocking Green from Newport Road, across the field adjacent to Hazel Row being included? This is a view relevant to many more people than some others.	<i>Following a Planning Inspector's report comment the SG thought this view should be included</i>
18	The extra 400 + houses have had a significant impact on the village and the council/plan should not support any more houses. The Community Orchard is brilliant. Asks for more trees to be	<i>The council setting up Tree Protection Orders could protect important trees. TPOs are not part of the NP.</i>

	planted around the village. Many on new estates and adjacent to the school have died. They were not properly looked-after. Can the Plan protect some of the mature trees around the village as these often seem to be felled?	