

Loose Parish Council

**Consultation Statement
Executive Summary – Reg 15 (2)(c) and (d)**

June 2018

*“Loose
a place
apart”*

Mrs Kim Owen
Clerk to the Parish Council

Loose Parish Council – Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement Executive Summary-Reg15(2)(c)/(d)

Introduction

This document is a summary of the Regulation 14 questionnaire responses, key issues raised and how they were addressed.

Pre-regulation 14 work is briefly summarised.

Pre-Regulation 14 issues/comments and their appraisal

Throughout this period the feedback from the engagement events detailed in the Consultation Statement, the Loose Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, in conjunction with its consultant (Feria Urbanism), gave the feedback due consideration. Where considered appropriate issues were added or deleted from the draft neighbourhood plan. Weight of public opinion being an important factor. The draft plan was frequently put into further engagement events for comment as it progressed. LPC website was widely used

There was a strong voice to retain the character of Loose and its surrounding area.

There was no call for new residential or commercial development.

Regulation 14 Consultation Questionnaire

A questionnaire covering each policy/section of the NP was put out for comment. Details of how and where it could be accessed were given in a “mail drop” to all homes and businesses in the parish. Details appeared on the LPC website and were set up on “survey monkey”. E-mails were sent to organisations with a statutory, business or community interest in Loose.

Categorisation of Regulation 14 questionnaire comments

The Steering Group initially appraised and categorised comments against the following criteria;

- Comments noted – no amendments to plan required.
- Outside scope of plan – no amendments required.
- Detailed design – no amendments required (very few arose).
- Plan covers whole parish (very few arose).
- Plan requires amendment.
- Covered elsewhere in plan.
- Covered in emerging MBC Local Plan.
- Comments ambiguous (very few).
- For possible amendment pending professional advice.

Decisions and subsequent amendments to the NP were made by the Steering Group in conjunction with its consultant and MBC. These were then approved by Loose PC.

Questionnaire questions / Breakdown of comments / issues raised / actions taken

NB. Only substantial amendments are referenced below.

Which parts of the plan do you like most and why? (Consultation Statement page 22)

14 “no comment” / 33 comments - no amendments / 1 amendment.

Responses were positive with widespread support for the plan.

Which parts of the plan could be improved and why? (p.28)

22 “no comment” / 21 comments - no amendments / 2 outside scope / 2 covered elsewhere / 1 covered by MBC local plan.

Good response and comments but no amendments considered necessary.

Have you any comments on the Loose PC context section? (p.35)

20 “no comment” / 19 comments - no amendments / 4 amendments / 2 outside scope / 1 covered elsewhere / 2 covered by MBC local plan.

Virtually all responses positive, no adverse issues raised.

Have you any comments on “Landscape Context” section? (p.41)

27 “no comment” / 17 comments - no amendments / 4 amendments.

Section has strong support with no major adverse comments.

Have you any comments on “Planning Policy Framework” section? (p.46)

23 “no comment” / 19 comments - no amendments / 3 amendments / 1 outside scope / 2 covered elsewhere.

Widespread support and little adverse criticism. However, comments from MBC on Landscape Protection led to a fairly major change. (See p.52 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy AM1? – Improve the pedestrian environment? (p.54)

2 “no comment” / 47 comments – no amendments / 5 amendments / 6 covered elsewhere.

There were 34 “support” comments and 3 “object”. 1 object comment led to amendment.

What are your views on Policy AM2 – The Village Green? (p.66)

2 “no comment” / 45 comments – no amendments / 1 amendment / 2 outside scope / 1 covered elsewhere..

Strong support (35 comments) and 1 objecting (point covered elsewhere).

What are your views on Policy LP1 – Landscape Protection? (p.75)

1 “no comment” / 46 comments – no amendments / 1 amendment / 2 outside scope / 1 covered elsewhere.

41 comments of “support”, 4 “do not know” and 1 object. The one amendment resulted from MBC suggested rewording to conform with NPPF policy. (See p.82 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy LP2 – Areas of Local Landscape Importance? (p.83)

46 comments – no amendments / 3 amendments / 1 outside scope.

Virtually 100% support. Changes made to align with MBC comments. (See p.90 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy LP3 – Design development in Countryside? (p.91)

1 “no comment” / 47 comments – no amendment / 4 amendments / 1 outside scope / 1 plan covers whole parish.

No objections and 38 comments supporting. Policy LP3 amended to accord with MBC view. (See p.98 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy LP4 – Natural Environment in Loose? (p.100)

1 “no comment” / 46 comments – no amendments / 1 amendment / 3 outside scope. 41 comments of support, 3 “do not know”. Plan amended in line with MBC suggestion. (See p.107 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy LP5 – Designated Green Spaces? (p.108)

48 comments – no amendments / 2 amendments / 2 outside scope.

Very strong support, including KCC. MBC support, but at variance with some designated spaces. Amendments made but not wholly as LPC consider designations are not absolute as a proven planning need would overturn designations. (See p.116,117 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy DQ1 – Design Quality? (p.118)

44 comments – no amendments / 7 amendments / 4 covered elsewhere.

38 supportive comments. Amendments are minor. MBC give general support and their suggestions have been incorporated. (See p.127 ref 48)

What are your views on Policy DQ2 – Extension of Article 4 Direction? (p.128)

While there was support to extend the Article 4 Direction area the MBC considered the plan was not the best place for it. Consequently, the project was deleted for it to be advanced elsewhere. The section was redrafted. (Useful feedback for the project). (See p.136 ref 48)

What are your views on policy DQ3 – Improve Community Building (Pavilion)? (p.137)

There is support and objection to this project policy. These comments were based on preliminary plans which are undergoing changes. LPC considered this project best advanced outside the neighbourhood plan and the section has been withdrawn.

Any other comments? (p.146)

17 “no comment” / 29 comments – no amendments / 2 amendments / 4 covered elsewhere / 1 covered by MBC Local Plan.

15 congratulatory comments, no adverse ones. MBC suggestions adopted. (See p.152 ref 48)

Written Responses (p.154)

10 comments – no amendments / 8 amendments / 2 covered elsewhere. (See p.158 ref 06; p.161 ref 08; p. 164 ref 10)

Communications with Statutory Bodies, Utilities, Community Groups etc

49 organisations with a statutory, business or community stake in Loose were e-mailed for comment. Responses were received from seven, five of which led to amendments of the plan. (See p.171 and 172)

Conclusions

The comments from MBC have been the major influence in amending and shaping this plan. LPC have seen value in adopting their advice. No objections of any magnitude have arisen from other sources to radically change it. There is strong support in Loose for this plan.

