

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

Key = Responses which have triggered changes to Pre-submission Draft

Some responses highlighted for clarity –to distinguish / separate responses

TG1 New Development in Tasset and Greystead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R1	Page 15, para 1	✓		Comments made <i>What on earth is overarching?</i>
				Response Defined as comprehensive, all embracing.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R2		✓		Comments made <i>Very little if any public transport which means more traffic therefore more pollution with new development</i>
				Response No sites have been allocated for housing development in the NDP so Highways Assessment is not required. Traffic consideration will be given to each individual planning application referencing TG2(p) and TG3(i)
				Action /Changes proposed None
R3		✓		Comments made <i>To encourage younger generation to remain in area and become involved in the community</i>
				Response The NDP acknowledges the shortage of local employment and social opportunities for young adults with the small stock of affordable houses to buy or rent. The intention of TG14:Our sustainable local economy is to encourage more young people to stay and live in the Parish.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG1 New Development in Tasset and Greystead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R4	Page 15 Page 19	✓		Comments made <i>Not keen on TG1 c). Building regs. Define a conservatory as having a clear polycarbonate roof. This policy would seem to prohibit the construction of a conservatory by their definition. If this is the intention, it perhaps should be made obvious.</i>
				Response Noted. Comment is directed to TG3(e) not TG1
				Action /Changes proposed TG3(e) glazed roofs on new buildings or extensions will not be permitted TG3 (h) incorporate sustainable design and energy efficiency measures <u>and minimise light spillage</u>
R5	Page 15		✓	Comments made <i>Differentiate between Park and Non Park</i>
				Response Acknowledged. Reference made to Park and Non Park throughout the NDP e.g. Policy explanation TG1. NNPA Core Strategy identifies Lanehead and Greenhaugh as local centres for development within the National Park. New development can only take place in these settlements.
				Action /Changes proposed Encompass Park and Non Park into TG2(a) policy intention. See SCR27.
R6		✓		Comments made <i>Hopefully – all consultations via the building inspector</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG1 New Development in Tarnet and Greystead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R7	Page 15	✓		Comments made <i>In favour particularly of affordable housing and very much in favour of permanent residency being encouraged over second homes</i>
				Response Noted. The policy explanation for TG1 "the main factor is that new buildings should be for permanent occupation only....."
				Action /Changes proposed None
R8	Page 15	✓		Comments made <i>All new build must be for local needs or affordable. I have a preference for the latter</i>
				Response Noted. This policy seeks to positively encourage new housing where it meets the needs of local communities, is affordable and / or where it will ensure that new housing will be permanently occupied.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R9	Page 15	✓		Comments made <i>Accommodation already at Thorneyburn and Lanehead – Part c)</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG1 New Development in Tasset and Greystead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R10	Page 15	✓		Comments made <i>Accommodation already at thorneyburn and Lanehead – Part c)</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R11			✓	Comments made <i>Not where NP policies ruin quality of life for residents</i>
				Response This NDP seeks to protect the quality of life for residents: policy explanation TG1 -.."to ensure that tourism proposals do not impact on the amenity of local communities...."; TG3(i) (k) The NDP supersedes NNPA Core Strategy.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R12			✓	Comments made <i>NP policies have systematically destroyed community spirit and way of life we had here</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed See R11 above

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG1 New Development in Tarset and Greystead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R13	Page 15	✓		Comments made <i>Prefer to keep the tranquillity of the area. No more new development</i>
				Response Noted. National policy requires NDP to be positive and guide appropriate development. Particular attention is given to tranquillity in TG2 and in the Landscape section.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R 14		✓		Comments made <i>Compatible = mutually tolerant. With public sector cuts the NNPA increasingly focuses on its statutory obligations. Thus while the neighbourhood plan should not undermine NNPA policies the neighbourhood plan can better reflect the wider aims, objectives and policies to maintain/achieve a sustainable community in Tarset and Greystead (a place where people want to live and work, both now and in the future – see plan vision page 12)).</i>
				Response Thank you for your support
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG1 New Development in Tasset and Greystead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R15			✓	Comments made <i>Enough development already</i>
				Response Noted. NPPF requires NDP to be positive and to guide appropriate development.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R16		✓		Comments made <i>It is more relevant and reflective of local needs and should ensure a more sustainable development of the area</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R17		✓		Comments made <i>I believe it is essential for the local community to have a say in development matters that have a profound impact on their neighbourhood</i>
				Response Noted. Consultations throughout the whole process have ensured that the local community have guided the NDP.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG2 General Development Principles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R18		✓		Comments made <i>Especially important – tranquillity /dark sky/biodiversity/signage</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R19		✓		Comments made <i>There are already restrictions on signage but no one from planning seems to enforce them. I hope this plan can improve the situation</i>
				Response Noted. NDP is designed to strengthen existing restrictions. At the very least, planning decisions will be informed by 'muted colours'. It is noted that some signs are permitted development rights.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R20		✓		Comments made <i>While I support energy efficient building development eg upvc timber buildings etc – are these in keeping with the heritage of the area?</i>
				Response Noted. The NDP, especially TG1, TG2 and TG8 ensure new development should respect the heritage of the area
				Action /Changes proposed No change.

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG2 General Development Principles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R21	Page 17	✓		Comments made <i>TG2 e) – 'informed' – what does this mean? It is architectural jargon and can hide a multitude of sins</i>
				Response Noted. The intention and the wording of the policy is ensure that information from the surrounding area is taken into account. In this context, informed means guided by the site.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R22			✓	Comments made <i>In who's opinion?</i>
				Response The NDP reflects the preferred approach of local residents, expressed through consultations.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R23			✓	Comments made <i>'to be applied alongside other policies in the Plan' deleted and " the statement should now read as corrected above"</i>
				Response TG2 are General Development Principles that are applied to all policies in the NDP.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG2 General Development Principles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R24			✓	Comments made <i>Prefer to keep the tranquillity of the area. No more new development</i>
				Response See response to R13
				Action /Changes proposed None
R25		✓		Comments made <i>I was a bit uneasy with criterion m) because of the phrase 'designated and non-designated heritage assets'. How is a non-designated asset defined or recognised? Also 'unacceptable impact' in criterion p) for the same reason.</i>
				Response Noted. NNPF para 136 defines differences between designated and on designated assets. Included in policy explanation on page 39 – <i>Non-designated Heritage Assets</i>
				Action /Changes proposed Definition of non-heritage assets to be added to glossary. Cross reference to NDP page 39. "These assets, although not all designated , <u>(see page 39)</u> are of historic interest" TG2 (m) <u>ensure any-not negatively</u> impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings <u>is kept to a minimum</u> in accordance with Policy TG8 cf Statutory Consultee Responses 70 TG2 (p) do not have an <u>unacceptable-adverse</u> impact on the local highway network.....

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG2 General Development Principles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R26		✓		Comments made <i>It is important that new development is sympathetic in its design to fit into the environment and area.</i>
				Response Noted. This has specific support in TG2e) TG2f) TG3b)
				Action /Changes proposed None
R27		✓		Comments made <i>Excellent ! Hopefully this policy will ensure that all new development is 'sympathetic' to the environment and local communities</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R28		✓		Comments made <i>Like TG3 this policy is essential to the preservation of the National Park, its tranquillity and to prevent negative inputs in development in local communities</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG3 High Quality and Sustainable Design

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R29		✓		Comments made <i>There is (invariably?) a slight tension between subjectivity (eg “ can sometimes be appropriate”) and prescriptiveness but I understand the (historic) reasons for the tone of this section</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R30		✓		Comments made <i>Pity some people have not adhered to this</i>
				Response Noted. NDP seeks to strengthen NNPA and NCC Core Strategies.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R31	Page 25	✓		Comments made <i>The section ‘solar panels’ Generally considered to be unsuitable for roof elevations facing roads .. would apply to my property but I would dispute this since there is a steep fell directly opposite on the other side of the road and therefore there is no ‘wider view’ to which solar panels could be detrimental.</i>
				Response The guidance on positioning solar panels is in the policy explanation and is tempered by “generally”. All applications are considered on a case by case basis.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG3 High Quality and Sustainable Design

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R32	Page 24	✓		Comments made <i>UPVC can, in fact be made to look virtually indistinguishable from wood and is easier to maintain and clean. I am unsure why certain types of upvc cannot be considered.</i>
				Response Agreed.
				Action /Changes proposed Sentence deleted from windows paragraph in policy explanation.
R33		✓		Comments made <i>Some contrasting buildings can enhance local character provided sympathetic to guidelines</i>
				Response Agreed and this is reflected in the policy explanation. " Whilst contemporary design is welcomed as offering creative solutions to 21 st century living, all development will be expected to be respectful towards and to match the high quality design of its predecessors."
				Action /Changes proposed None
R34	Page 21	✓		Comments made <i>Should there be a 'the' before character in criterion b)?</i>
				Response Agreed.
				Action /Changes proposed Insert 'the' before 'character' in criterion b).

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG3 High Quality and Sustainable Design

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R35			✓	Comments made <i>This policy appears to rule out any possibility of new style properties which is too restrictive</i>
				Response TG4 does not rule out new style properties. Contemporary design is welcomed – see response to R33.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R36		✓		Comments made <i>Signage at Tarset Tor and Greystones at Lanehead does not meet the criteria for muted colours</i>
				Response True - but future applications will be considered against the criteria set out in this NDP.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R37		✓		Comments made <i>All too prescriptive on the specifics. High quality is important</i>
				Response Agreed that high quality is important. The intention of TG3 is to promote high quality and sustainable design. Spence and Dower's Landscape and Design Assessment offers guiding principles.
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG3 High Quality and Sustainable Design

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R38			✓	Comments made <i>Too prescriptive. This is meant to be a planning document, not a missive from the taste police.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R39			✓	Comments made <i>Too prescriptive eg a blanket ban on conservatories</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed Delete TG3e) glazed roofs on new buildings or extensions will not be permitted Insert 'minimise light spillage' in TG3 h)
R40	Pages 24 +25	✓		Comments made <i>p.24. There are few attached garages in the Parish – surely integral ones would be less obtrusive. P25 roofs – water tabling should be included.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed Changes proposed : Page 24 Garages Delete “are inappropriate and”. Sentence now reads “Integral garages are inappropriate and should be avoided as they are not in character.” Page 25 Roofs Insert “such as water tabling” . The sentence now reads “ The finer details of roofs should also reflect those found widely in the Parish with <u>such as water tabling</u> , gutters close to walls and appropriate rainwater goods.”

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG3 High Quality and Sustainable Design

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R44		✓		Comments made <i>Good idea to tighten up on the very loose wording in the NNPA guidelines.</i>
				Response Agreed.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R45		✓		Comments made <i>This policy is key to ensuring the character of National Park vernacular architecture is preserved and I fully support it.</i>
				Response Noted.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R46		✓		Comments made <i>Design must fit into the environment without conflicting, new design is fine so long as it is sympathetic.</i>
				Response Agreed. This is the essence of the NDP
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG3 High Quality and Sustainable Design

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R47	Pages 21-26	✓		Comments made <i>It is important that people are clear what is viewed as high quality design so that there is a clear bench mark for people to work to.</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG4 Protection of Open space between Lanehead and Greenhaugh

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R48		✓		Comments made <i>Merging would particularly detrimental to the character of the whole area.</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None
R49			✓	Comments made <i>Again – too restrictive – each application should be judged on their own merit</i>
				Response Noted. TG4 reflects NPPF, paragraphs 28, 54 and 55
				Action /Changes proposed None
R50		✓		Comments made <i>It is a bit late now</i>
				Response Noted. TG4 is in response to consultation. Its intention is to prevent any further gradual merging of the two settlements.
				Action /Changes proposed Noted.

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG4 Protection of Open space between Lanehead and Greenhaugh

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R51		✓		Comments made <i>Most important to protect this space to help maintain 'feel' of the area and prevent 'ribbon' development</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R52		✓		Comments made <i>Yes, it is key to maintain this separation and preserve the views of open countryside. Fully support</i>
				Response Noted with thanks.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R53		✓		Comments made <i>It is essential that there is no ribbon development to threaten the spectacular views here.</i>
				Response Agreed.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R54		✓		Comments made <i>A good idea – it is an important concept</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG5 Spatial Development in Lanehead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R55		✓		Comments made <i>Well thought out detailed policy</i>
				Response Noted with thanks
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R56	Pages 29 + 30		✓	Comments made <i>Infill development only in A,B and C would result in over dense development of those areas . Better to allow development between and maintain current development density. I heartily disagree with the intention here. To my mind, infill development would result in the type of gross overdevelopment that is seen in many urban estates, where dwellings have been 'shoe-horned' into small infill plots. The spacing of the dwellings existent defines the character of the settlement as it is. Better to allow development between the sub-divisions and maintain the spacing relationship of the settlement as a whole.</i>
				Response Noted. Spence and Dower's Landscape and Design Assessment identified the character of the settlement and development areas which is reflected in the Plan and has been supported by the community through many stages of consultation.
				Action /Changes proposed No change in content but for better clarity, TG5 restructured. See response to SCR13, SCR26, SCR35, SCR42
R57		✓		Comments made <i>You may be too late. NNPA have already destroyed any character</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG5 Spatial Development in Lanehead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R58		✓		Comments made <i>But I fear that the stable door is being shut after the horse has bolted</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R59		✓		Comments made <i>Development to avoid areas of open countryside and avoid appearing prominent within a) the landscape and b) the settlement.</i>
				Response Noted. This is included in TG2a) TG2e) TG4 TG5 TG11 TG12 TG13
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R60		✓		Comments made <i>The'mature tree cover' at Lower Lanehead is Leylandii</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG5 Spatial Development in Lanehead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R66		✓		Comments made <i>Very important</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R67			✓	Comments made <i>Lanehead is large enough</i>
				Response Noted. In line with NPPF, the NDP is positive towards appropriate development
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R68		✓		Comments made <i>Lanehead is a patchwork of different styles and it is important not to exacerbate the current status and keep development appropriately designed and located.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG5 Spatial Development in Lanehead

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R69	Page 29	✓		Comments made <i>Fully support policy and criteria i) – v) presuming against development in these key locations</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R70		✓		Comments made <i>Hope this policy will help to preserve what we have and stop any future inappropriate development</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG6 Spatial Development in Greenhaugh

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R71	Pages 32 + 33	✓		Comments made <i>Development to the east should reflect the existing pattern of terrace semis and few detached houses</i>
				Response Noted. This is referred to in TG6a)
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R72	Page 33		✓	Comments made <i>Badly drawn definition. Developer could build 10 house on school site thus braking linear tradition</i>
				Response Disagree. Spence and Dower's Tasset and Greystead Landscape and Design Assessment defines potential areas of opportunity for development and change.TG6a) states "all development should be located and designed to fit into the character and streetscape in Greenhaugh"
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R73		✓		Comments made <i>Badly drawn map. No good planning reason to include school site, breaking the linear tradition, opening the way for 10 plus houses</i>
				Response Disagree. See reponse R72
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG6 Spatial Development in Greenhaugh

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R74		✓		Comments made <i>Well thought through detailed policy</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R75		✓		Comments made <i>As for TG5 – development which might affect or fundamentally change the appearance of the landscape and settlement should be avoided</i>
				Response Agree
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R76		✓/x		Comments made <i>Not sure. Too tight adherence to the past may be the rather 'plastic' death of a community</i>
				Response Noted. A significant amount of new development is planned for Greenhaugh and has been submitted to NNPA.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG6 Spatial Development in Greenhaugh

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R77	Page 33	✓		Comments made <i>I think the northern edge boundary is much too far away from Greenhaugh</i>
				Response Policy TG6 is pro-development defined by the development edges outlined on Proposals Map 4. These reflect the two planning applications which have already been sought and to date, in one application has been approved.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R78		✓		Comments made <i>Sensible</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R79		✓		Comments made <i>Yes, fully support – these proposals will preserve the essential character of Greenhaugh</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG6 Spatial Development in Greenhaugh

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R80	Page 32	✓		Comments made <i>Greenhaugh is special. Development here should retain the character of this settlement.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R81		✓		Comments made <i>Good idea to restrict the development area of the village and particularly like the idea of insisting on sequential development to prevent undeveloped sites.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG7 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R82	Page 35	✓		Comments made <i>Support bringing stone buildings back into use</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R83		✓		Comments made <i>Only for traditional stone and slate type buildings not for modern wooden stable blocks</i>
				Response Noted. There are safeguards in policies TG2 and TG3
				Action /Changes proposed None
R84		✓		Comments made <i>Strongly support equality for residential or business and live-work accommodation</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG7 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R85	Page 35	✓		Comments made <i>Very much support the conversion of redundant buildings over new builds where possible allowing for constraints in wildlife preservation</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None
R86	Page 35	✓		Comments made <i>But point g) is vital for bats/owls/swifts etc</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None
R87		✓		Comments made <i>Biased towards residential rather than business ie holiday accommodation</i>
				Response Disagree. Policy intention clearly states that "equal status is given to residential and business use."
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG7 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R88	Page 35	✓		<p>Comments made <i>BUT strongly disagree with TG7 c). If permission given for a conversion; given good design lets admit it is now a barn etc and be honest about its new use. General - There are aspects of this policy that I feel are - fundamentally wrong. I am of the opinion that, if permission is granted for the conversion of-a redundant building, that decision presumably includes the possibility of a change of use. The advisability or otherwise of that change must be the responsibility of the planning authorities. But, having made that decision, let us be open and honest about it, and allow, for example, chimney stacks to be built for internal heating. The decision has been made - it is now a house, so let us allow it to be seen to be so!</i> <i>Furthermore, as the existent housing density at the Hott (and possibly the Eals)complex is greater than that at the subdivisions of the Lanehead settlements, I would argue that development should be allowed on an infill basis there also, subject of course to the same design requirements that would be imposed on any Lanehead infill.</i></p>
				<p>Response Noted. NDP must be in compliance with NNPA core strategy which clearly identifies Lanehead and Greenhaugh as settlements for sustainable development. The Hott and Eals have not been identified as such and are therefore deemed to be in open countryside.</p>
				<p>Action /Changes proposed None</p>
R89			✓	<p>Comments made <i>The policy restricts the development of redundant buildings into interesting buildings that can add 'character' to the Parish</i></p>
				<p>Response TG7 is for conversions of redundant buildings and are an existing part of landscape features. New buildapplies elsewhere in the Plan and does not preclude modern design as is stated in TG3 – High Quality and Susatailable Design, supported by its policy explanation.</p>
				<p>Action /Changes proposed None</p>

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG7 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R90	Page 35 +36	✓		Comments made <i>Very great care needed in the building of extensions</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None
R91			✓	Comments made <i>No because it references TG2 and TG3</i>
				Response Noted. See response to R89.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R92	Page 35	✓		Comments made <i>'Removing permitted development rights from consents for conversions' sounds a bit dubious to me. Not that I have any knowledge about such things</i>
				Response Noted. Local Planning Authorities remove permitted development rights from consents for conversions without planning application.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG7 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R93	Page 35	✓		Comments made <i>Has an attempt been made to identify these redundant buildings in the Plan area?</i>
				Response No definitive list has been made. Any applications will be made on a case-by-case basis.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R94		✓		Comments made <i>Excellent. Never understood the NNPA policy on redundant buildings</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R95		✓		Comments made <i>I think this is one of the most significant changes that is needed. Redundant buildings should be allowed a new lease of life for appropriate use.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG7 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R96	Page 35	✓		Comments made <i>Redundant buildings should be saved</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R97		✓		Comments made <i>Hopefully this will encourage use of redundant buildings and prevent inappropriate or over development</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R98		✓		Comments made <i>Yes, the current NNPA policy has caused an anomaly where redundant buildings outside settlements can only be for business use. I, like <u>all</u> residents, think this should be reversed, as here.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG8 Heritage Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R99	Pages 38-41	✓		Comments made <i>Too many signs must be avoided</i>
				Response Agreed. Supported in Criterion TG2o) "ensure signage is kept to a minimum."
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R100		✓		Comments made <i>Too many signs must be avoided</i>
				Response As for R99
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R101		✓		Comments made <i>Only if the policy is not a blanket preservation tool</i>
				Response Noted. NDP promotes the conservation, not preservation, of heritage assets. See SCR 77
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG8 Heritage Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R102	Pages 38 - 41	✓		Comments made <i>Difficult to defend in light of past decisions eg greenhouse attached to farm steading (Redheugh)</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R103			✓	Comments made <i>Too prescriptive and too late eg Lanehead</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R104	Page 39	✓		Comments made <i>The TAG list is not available. The local list does not exist</i>
				Response TAG list is available as a hard copy available for reference in the Village Hall. Acknowledged that the local list does not yet exist- see NDP page 39 subsection: <i>Locally Listed Heritage Assets</i>
				Action /Changes proposed Include in Appendix 2 Community Action Proposals – Historic and natural features = “Enhance protection of historic and natural features by compiling database of Heritage Assets <u>to be included on Local List</u> ”

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG8 Heritage Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R105	Pages 38 - 41	✓		Comments made <i>What a good idea</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R106		✓		Comments made <i>Need to keep the feel and uniqueness of the area and not how impacted on by development</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R107		✓		Comments made <i>This does not however feel like a very robust defence of heritage assets but I am aware that the policy has had to be extensively modified to national planning framework</i>
				Response Noted. The policy intention and policy for TG8 and its explanation, together with the important detail in Appendix 3 The Historic Environment, protect important heritage assets. The policy has been strengthened through amendments (see SCR29 and SCR37).
				Action /Changes proposed No further change.

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG8 Heritage Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R108	Page 39	✓		<p>Comments made <i>'Whether designated or not' again. Maybe non-designated should be defined as in TG8 before TG2. Perhaps I missed it.</i></p>
				<p>Response Noted. See response to R25.</p>
				<p>Action /Changes proposed As for R25</p>

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG9 Tarset and Greystead Bastles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R109	Page 42		✓	Comments made <i>Rubbish</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R110			✓	Comments made <i>No good planning reason</i>
				Response Noted.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R111	Page 42		✓	Comments made <i>The idea of sight lines between bastles was investigated by TAG a few years ago. TAG members said they found no evidence to support this theory. The Bastle trail is a contemporary addition. There is nothing about sight lines in the supporting documents.</i>
				Response Agreed. There is no definitive answer but the importance of sight lines may have been established through rural myth. No documentary evidence.
				Action /Changes proposed Remove reference to sight lines from Policy Intention : To ensure that the important setting of the Bastles and the Tarset Bastle Trail is maintained and that future development does not prejudice the re-introduction of sight lines between grouping of bastles in the future. TG9 Policy Particular consideration will be given to securing the sightlines between bastles, and protecting them, and their settings, from development which would compromise these views. Any proposals which would have an adverse impact on the sightlines or setting of bastles, or on the appreciation of their significance in relation to one another, will not be supported.

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG9 Tarsset and Greystead Bastles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R112	Page 42		✓	Comments made <i>It is arguable whether sight lines between bastles ever existed</i>
				Response As for R111
				Action /Changes proposed As for R111
R113		✓		Comments made <i>Why would we need to re-introduce sight lines – would we need to demolish something?</i>
				Response Noted. See R111
				Action /Changes proposed See R111
R114		✓		Comments made <i>Strongly approve. Would like to see further work on restoration or consolidation of ruins and some negotiation for occasional public access to privately owned historic buildings (bastles)</i>
				Response Noted. Access to privately owned properties is not a planning issue.
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG9 Tarsset and Greystead Bastles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R115	Page 42	✓		Comments made <i>Very sensible</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R116		✓		Comments made <i>Good idea – an underused attraction that should be maintained</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R117		✓		Comments made <i>The bastles in the district are a unique asset and should be actively promoted, perhaps as part of eco-museum concept going forward</i>
				Response Noted. Actively being promoted by TAG and wild Northumbria [Appendix 2 – Community Action Proposals]
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG9 Tarset and Greystead Bastles

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R118	Page 42	✓		Comments made <i>Yes, but I agree with comments made by other residents that this policy is too focussed on the group of bastles along the Tarset Burn. It should refer more widely to bastles in the Parish. Hope you can reflect this in a <u>modification</u> of the policy.</i>
				Response Acknowledged.
				Action /Changes proposed Delete “along the Tarset Burn” from Policy Explanation to read The bastle clusters along the Tarset Burn are a unique element of the Parish’s cultural landscape.”

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG10 Archaeology

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R119	Page 43		✓	Comments made <i>Impossible to grade importance</i>
				Response Disagree. Professional bodies, such as Historic England, use a specific set of criteria to assess the significance of heritage assets (briefly outlined on NDP page 40 as part of TG8).
				Action /Changes proposed Some changes made to policy – see SCR 38
R120			✓	Comments made <i>Look forward not back</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R121		✓		Comments made <i>The local group has already done excellent work</i>
				Response Support noted.
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG10 Archaeology

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R122	Page 43	✓		Comments made <i>Very sensible</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R123		✓		Comments made <i>Good</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R124	Page 43	✓		Comments made <i>Documented and potentially photographed and undisturbed as far as possible or exposed and featured where appropriate</i>
				Response Agreed. See SCR 37. Also supported in TG7c_) – see response to SCR 74 + SCR 75
				Action /Changes proposed See SCR 37 which inserts in TG8 c) where any changes are proposed, the opportunity should be taken to <u>record and</u> provide information interpreting it.

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG11 Development in the Rolling Upland Valleys

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R125	Pages 45 - 47	✓		Comments made <i>This will be the last generation of farmers then tree overlayed with wind turbines.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R126		✓		Comments made <i>Ground based solar panels and shepherds huts etc are very intrusive</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R127	Page 45	✓		Comments made <i>Too late for d) at Lanehead</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG11 Development in the Rolling Upland Valleys

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R128	Page 45	✓		Comments made <i>Hedges are also acceptable. They are in a lot of old images of the area</i>
				Response Agreed. TG3 f) has been changed by inserting “ and hedges” . Now reads “ boundary treatments must be sensitive to the context of the area using stone wall enclosures <u>and hedges</u> , where possible.
				Action /Changes proposed Insert into TG11f)” where possible, ensure that new development in this landscape area incorporates stone wall enclosures <u>or hedges</u> , to enhance the character of the area and tie in new development with its surroundings”
R129		✓		Comments made <i>No more rampant tourist developments, infrastructure cannot cope.</i>
				Response Noted.The NDP supports appropriate tourism development where the proposal is of a scale appropriate to the area (TG15). References to the infrastructure is highlighted in TG2.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R130	Page 46	✓		Comments made <i>Part h) purchase necessary</i>
				Response Noted. Purchase is not essential but agreement of the landowner is required.
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG11 Development in the Rolling Upland Valleys

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R131	Page 46	✓		Comments made <i>Part h) purchase necessary</i>
				Response See comment for R130
				Action /Changes proposed None
R132	Page 46	✓		Comments made <i>i) ' designated and non-designated areas' ie everywhere</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed TG11i) opportunities are taken to support and enhance biodiversity and habitats both in designated and non-designated areas
R133			✓	Comments made <i>Too restrictive – appears to be more of a catch-all policy to prevent new development</i>
				Response NDP supports new development to meet the needs of the local community (TG1)
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG11 Development in the Rolling Upland Valleys

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R134	Page 45		✓	Comments made <i>TG11 e) – disagree on the 'choice of materials'</i>
				Response Noted. Good design is the essence of the Plan.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG12 Development in the Rolling Uplands

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R135	Pages 48 - 49	✓		Comments made <i>Be aware – most land is in government or private ownership</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R136		✓		Comments made <i>Be aware – most land is in Government or private ownership</i>
				Response As above – R136
				Action /Changes proposed None
R137		✓		Comments made <i>Too late and is this really in the group's remit</i>
				Response NDP reflects the comments of the majority of the community and seeks to ensure appropriate development, looking to the future.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG12 Development in the Rolling Uplands

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R138	Pages 48 - 49	✓		Comments made <i>When the farmers are gone so are the rolling Uplands</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R139		✓		Comments made <i>To protect the overall landscape from dominant intrusive features</i>
				Response Agreed. Special features of the landscape are listed throughout the NDP.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R140	Page 48	✓		Comments made <i>Intent good – English poor! All statements should be able to read on from ‘Development -..... supported:’ they don’t</i>
				Response Disagree.
				Action /Changes proposed Delete : at end of policy heading in green box

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG12 Development in the Rolling Uplands

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R141	Page 48	✓		Comments made <i>The character of the area must be maintained</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None
R142		✓		Comments made <i>The landscape around the Parish is breathtaking and must be preserved for future generations</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R143			✓	Comments made <i>No new development</i>
				Response Noted. NDP positively supports appropriate development.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG13 Development in the Moorland and Forest Mosaic

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R144	Page 50		✓	Comments made <i>This includes TG9 and therefore needs to be NO – otherwise would have been YES</i>
				Response Noted.
				Action /Changes proposed TG13c) has been amended to read “the Bastles, <u>and</u> their settings and the links between them are protected in line with policy TG9;”
R145			✓	Comments made <i>Due to reference to TG9</i>
				Response As for R144
				Action /Changes proposed As for R144
R146	Page 50	✓		Comments made <i>Perhaps criterion d) should begin with a ‘they’ (referring back to the Development proposals...) There seems to be two criteria labelled ‘d)’</i>
				Response Agree
				Action /Changes proposed Change TG13d) to “ ensure that the development does not compromise the recreational value of bridleways, footpaths and trails.” Amend lettering on list in policy box. Criterion go from a) to f)

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG13 Development in the Moorland and Forest Mosaic

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R147	Pages 50 – 51		✓	Comments made <i>The forestry is ugly and now strategically unnecessary. It has wrecked the valley as has the reservoir. The area covered in trees should be allowed to revert to open moorland.</i>
				Response Noted. Forestry is not a planning matter. NDP looks to the future and looks to support appropriate development.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R148		✓		Comments made <i>All forestry now</i>
				Response Disagree.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R149		✓		Comments made <i>Are you frightened to use the word wind turbines</i>
				Response Large wind turbines are specifically controlled by government policy and are beyond the remit of NDP and LPAs.
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG13 Development in the Moorland and Forest Mosaic

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R150	Pages 50 – 51	✓		Comments made <i>The landscape around the Parish is breathtaking and must be preserved for future generations</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed None
R151		✓		Comments made <i>The T & G landscape is exceptional and I fully support this and the following policies TG12 and TG13 which should ensure its preservation into the future.</i>
				Response Agreed.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R152		✓		Comments made <i>Hopefully this will help to maintain the unique 'feel' of the area to stop inappropriate development.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG14 Our Sustainable Economy

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R153	Page 53	✓		Comments made <i>Everything always impinges on someone. Support local business. Too much tourism paying badly creating part-time jobs.</i>
				Response Noted. TG14 encourages sustainable and local businesses, not being reliant on tourism. A good balance is sought.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R154		✓		Comments made <i>Small businesses not majoring on tourism would sustain the area 12 months in the year</i>
				Response Agreed. See response to R153
				Action /Changes proposed None
R155		✓		Comments made <i>Strongly support encouraging young people to stay and move into the area to benefit the community and ageing population</i>
				Response Agree
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG14 Our Sustainable Economy

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R156	Page 53		✓	Comments made <i>I am sick of being part of the rustic sideshow. See 'grumpy farmer' on utube</i>
				Response
				Action /Changes proposed
R157		✓		Comments made <i>But does the plan prohibit/ discourage incoming residents from building homes whose employment is beyond the Parish and adjacent parishes. Should we do more to encourage young people to move into the area</i>
				Response Noted. NDP encourages people to move into the area to establish appropriate businesses – as in Table 1: Definition Local Needs (v). this is less restrictive than NNPA core strategy.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R158		✓		Comments made <i>This policy will become more important with the passage of time, particularly with the ageing demographic profile.</i>
				Response Agreed
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG14 Our Sustainable Economy

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R159	Page 53	✓		Comments made <i>A well thought out policy which gives clear underpinning for future planning</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R160		✓		Comments made <i>This is a well judged policy promoting new business and sustainability at a small scale which is appropriate in a National Park.</i>
				Response Support noted.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R161		✓		Comments made <i>Very important policy and fully agree with the restrictions i, ii, iii and iv.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG15 Sustainable Tourism and Recreation Development

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R162	Pages 54 - 55	✓		Comments made <i>Or privacy of local residents</i>
				Response Agreed. Explicit reference is made to avoiding an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of local residents in TG15a) and the amenity of local residents in General Development Principles TG2f)
				Action /Changes proposed None
R163		✓		Comments made <i>Tourism does not offer the jobs needed to sustain the area</i>
				Response Agreed, this is why TG14 seeks to create a positive framework for the local economy, encouraging more young people to stay, live and work in the Parish.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R164		✓		Comments made <i>Does not include advertising for hen parties and remains of Chinese lanterns and balloons littering the countryside and bags of dog poo left on top of walls and fences</i>
				Response Noted. No specific reference to the above but TG15a) does state “ the proposed use will not have an unacceptable, adverse impact on the living conditions of local residents and neighbouring land-uses as defined in Policy TG2”
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG15 Sustainable Tourism and Recreation Development

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R165	Pages 54 - 55	✓		Comments made <i>The building at Tasset tor – a blight on the landscape – how did that pass planning?? Also new build next to Tasset tor, light from velux windows in roof shine all night – withes effect on DARK SKY</i>
				Response Acknowledged. NDP looks to the future and seeks to minimise light spillage in future development. TG2h)
				Action /Changes proposed None
R166		✓		Comments made <i>Or cause a nuisance to neighbouring properties</i>
				Response Agreed. Avoiding nuisance is clearly supported through criteria TG2i) and TG15a)
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R167		✓		Comments made <i>Any development of tourism which provides a sole income is likely to be intrusive so tourism as diversification is better suited</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG15 Sustainable Tourism and Recreation Development

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R168	Pages 54 - 55	✓		Comments made <i>I wonder how Tasset Tor could have succeeded in planning for their blights on landscape. Also dark sky – adverse effect by new build next to Tasset Tor – velux windows showing lights all night</i>
				Response Noted – see response to R165
				Action /Changes proposed None
R169		✓		Comments made <i>I would like to express my vote against further tourist development in the area. Should developments take place I support the policy</i>
				Response Acknowledged
				Action /Changes proposed None
R170				Comments made <i>I would like to express my vote against further tourist development in the area. Should developments take place I support the policy</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG15 Sustainable Tourism and Recreation Development

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R171	Pages 54 - 55	✓		Comments made <i>This a well balanced policy which supports appropriate tourism but will preclude developments unsuited to a National Park.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R172		✓		Comments made <i>Not happy with increased tourism but accept that these criteria will help ensure development is sympathetic to the area.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R173		✓		Comments made <i>The critical proviso here is that development must be for appropriate usage. A backpackers hostel is fine but a stag and hen-party venue is totally inappropriate.</i>
				Response Noted. TG15a) clearly references “the proposed use will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of local residents and neighbouring land-uses as defined in Policy TG2”
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG16 Protection and Creation of Community Assets

Response reference	Page/ Paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R174	Page 56		✓	Comments made <i>We have no community assets worth saving</i>
				Response Disagree. The majority of responses from the community place significant value on existing community assets.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R175			✓	Comments made <i>WHY?</i>
				Response See response to R174
				Action /Changes proposed None
R176		✓		Comments made <i>Maintain what we have</i>
				Response Noted. NDP seeks to protect existing community assets. TG16
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG16 Protection and Creation of Community Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R177	Page 56	✓		Comments made <i>Is Sidwood included as a Community Asset?</i>
				Response Nor included on draft Plan.
				Action /Changes proposed Add Sidwood to list of current community assets in Policy TG16
R178		✓		Comments made <i>Make sure 'Blacksmiths Cottage' is part of the 'Holly Bush Inn'</i>
				Response Noted. Not within the power of NDP to make this happen- not a planning matter.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R179		✓		Comments made <i>If Thorneyburn Church is seen as a community asset then I would suggest that more people should be encouraged to attend services and not just birth, marriages, deaths.</i>
				Response Noted. This is not a planning matter.
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG16 Protection and Creation of Community Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R180	Page 56	✓		Comments made <i>Community assets such as village hall, church, pub are an essential part of the fabric for a sustainable community and must be protected.</i>
				Response Agreed. This is the intention of TG16
				Action /Changes proposed None
R181		✓		Comments made <i>Good idea – particularly the restrictions!</i>
				Response Noted.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R182		✓		Comments made <i>It is key to preserve these community assets for future generations. Fully support.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG16 Protection and Creation of Community Assets

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R183	Page 56	✓		Comments made <i>Good idea with thought to the restrictions included</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R184		✓		Comments made <i>Essential for social fabric</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG17 Small Scale Renewable energy Infrastructure

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R185	Pages 58 – 61		✓	Comments made <i>If govt subsidies are removed the whole thing collapses</i>
				Response Noted. Not a planning issue.
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R186			✓	Comments made <i>Large scale wind generation would be ideal due to our prevailing westerly wind, no fracking though</i>
				Response Noted. Analysis of community responses to “Would you be in favour of large scale wind farms built within the Parish?” demonstrate 95.65% are against such developments.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R187	Page 58		✓	Comments made <i>The wording of the proposal is not clear enough</i>
				Response Noted. For clarity, some changes has been made to the policy and policy explanation See response to SCR 22 + SCR 23
				Action /Changes proposed See response to SCR22 + SCR 23

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG17 Small Scale Renewable Energy Infrastructure

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R188	Pages 58 - 61	✓		Comments made <i>Very small scale</i>
				Response Noted. TG17 supports small scale renewable energy infrastructure.
				Action /Changes proposed None
R189	Page 61		✓	Comments made <i>Solar panels separate from a property (as shown) are unsightly and can be seen from a greater distance than those attached to roofs.</i>
				Response Noted.
				Action /Changes proposed Insert a greater range of photographic examples on page 61
R190	Pages 58 + 61	✓		Comments made <i>Mention adverse effect on drainage in TG17 f). Heat pumps must be mentioned. Insulation should be added too. Solar PV example photo should be removed replace with an example of roof mounted. The wind turbine photo does not show anything of a useable scale</i>
				Response Noted. Heat pumps are not a planning matter. Insulation is a building regulation. Solar PC amended – see response to R189.
				Action /Changes proposed Add 'drainage' to list in TG17f).

Residents' Responses from Pre-submission Draft March- May 2015

TG17 Small Scale Renewable Energy Infrastructure

Response reference	Page/ paragraph	Agree		
		Yes	No	
R191	Pages 58 – 61	✓		Comments made <i>This is the future and needs to be included</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None
R192		✓		Comments made <i>Hopefully will prevent desecration of the area by large scale 'eco energy' developments</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed No change
R193		✓		Comments made <i>Excellent policy that will allow small scale renewables but should preclude any adverse impact on the unique T&G landscape.</i>
				Response Noted
				Action /Changes proposed None

Residents Responses from Pre-Submission Consultation – May 2015

Response reference	Page/ Paragraph	
R194	<p>Parts 1, 2, 3, and 4</p> <p>Front cover</p> <p>Page 5</p> <p>Page 7</p>	<p>Comments made</p> <p>Notes and comments on T and G NDP pre-submission draft</p> <p>These are submitted in the context of over-all admiration for both the amount and the quality of work that the Steering Group has done. In the main the document is very professional and clearly written, with a well-designed layout to include plenty of ‘white space’. The included maps, photographs and illustrations give the document as excellent clarity and finish.</p> <p>The core content in the statement and definition of the policies that need to guide planning for the next 20 years is excellent, and any omissions or queries about these at this stage are probably things that the PC should have picked up on at an earlier stage as in need of more detailed debate or clarification.</p> <p>Ultimately as the commissioning body the PC carries the responsibility for the plan and will have to oversee its implementation into the future. It is hoped than none of the following comments and points are seen as anything other than constructive to the over-all purpose of giving the document the final polish its quality deserves.</p> <p>I have worked through using 3 perspectives – content assessment, editorial points and factual omission or queries.</p> <p>Part 1. opening pages 0 - 6</p> <p>Front cover: fact of wrong designation of this photo already raised. It is a great one to give a sense of the horizons and space. A strapline like Northern Gateway panoramic view across Tarsset and beyond to the Cheviot range would be accurate enough</p> <p>remove ‘page 1’ from front cover</p> <p>Foreword: as this is work instigated and commissioned by the PC the norm is for this to be written by or at least attributed to (with his agreement) the PC Chair! The SG chair then provides an introduction or another foreword on behalf of the group.</p> <p>Page 5: move the what happens next section to RH column for clarity, and finish off Introduction with a general comment from the SG / chair</p> <p>Snapshot p.7</p> <p>People: 1.5 persons per square km would be better.</p> <p>(this could include holiday lets) - either it does or it doesn’t ? would be more simply expressed as (inclusive of holiday lets)</p> <p>Community facilities:</p> <p>Lanehead does not have a village hall !! Tarsset and Greystead parish has a village hall situated at Lanehead</p>

R194 contd.	Front cover Foreword Page 5 Page 7	<p>Response Noted</p> <p>Action /Changes proposed Front cover – strap line for photo already changed. Pagination on front cover removed. Chair of Parish Council signed Foreword. Formatting already amended. Change 1.5 people to 1.5 persons Delete (this could include holiday lets) to <i>inclusive of holiday lets</i> Delete Lanehead has a Village Hall . Insert <i>The Village Hall, which is a focal point for the community, is located at Lanehead.</i></p>
R195	Pages 9 – 11	<p>Comments made <u>Parts 2 and 3</u> read very clearly only query is re Housing requirement - it was my understanding the NP planners simply adopted the NCC figures and used them - in the PC's view totally inappropriately for this deeply rural area; this came to light when it was shown that the way the NCC calculated the stats for allowable percentages was erroneous (a big issue around 2 years ago when a professional statistician took apart NCC methodology, at much the same time as Burnbank housing was being waived through as justified); is there now a separation from NCC figures agreed by NP planners ?</p> <p>Response Noted - PC's view questioning LPAs' statistics for demand for housing. For the purposes of NDP, consultation with the community is the basis of information provided within the Plan.</p> <p>Action /Changes proposed No change</p>
R196	Pages 12-13	<p>Comments made <u>Part 4: Vision and Objectives</u> - another very clear section Query re accuracy of statement that <i>the majority of all NP residents live in the Plan Area.</i> 289 persons in 158 households, where NP has around 2000 households? And see the figure just for employed people living in the Park, quoted from the May 2013 Report <i>Valuing England's National Parks</i> <i>Occupational profile Table A1.62 shows that there are fewer than 1,200 employed people living in the Northumberland National Park, a particularly high proportion of whom are employed in skilled trade occupations (26%). There is also a relatively high proportion of people with elementary occupations. In contrast, there are relatively few people with administrative, sales, customer service, caring leisure and other service occupations compared to both the National Park and national averages.</i> <i>ONS (2013) Characteristics of National Parks, 2011; and Census 2011 data</i></p>

<p>R198 contd.</p>	<p>Page 53 Page 58</p>	<p>very old only, not true to date - demographic includes a lot of working age people surely, not just wrinklies like me p.53 unwanted k in local, penultimate para p.58 TG7 point c. delete. we cannot possibly stipulate that the majority of energy generated is consumed on site! Unless you want to supply all those generating with expensive battery storage....currently on a good day I am using about 5% what I generate, feeding in the rest And if it feeds into the grid, as it does, it contributes to the national supply, cannot be earmarked for local use. Also p.60 , same point. It <i>won't</i> mean this at all, unless you want to fund those batteries for people.... Eventually it might become possible, but not yet. There is a difference of course between those schemes on-grid and those off-grid - the latter have to have battery banks p.60 settlement pattern is surely a distant view not an aerial one? Haven't had time to check all the Appendices as yet –but a few things caught the eye.... Page 70 But in Community Action Proposals, p...70 Promote Area. TAG has been doing this kind of thing for years and has plans to develop.... Page 72 p.72 why not properly call them <i>graynes</i> (i.e. surnames) Highgreen origins - was an 18thC farmhouse surely which was added on to and 'gentrified' in the 19thC</p>
	<p>Page 51</p>	<p>Response All comments noted. The intention is for any small scale renewable to be at best energy neutral over the year and to discourage large scale turbines. The Community Action Proposals were submitted in its present form by PC after discussions at their meeting/s.</p> <p>Action /Changes proposed Changes as listed above to pages 16,18,28,30,41,53, 72 Delete 'particularly ensuring sight lines between them are retained or re-instated where the opportunity arises.' See R111. For greater clarity, amend TG17c) the majority of the energy produced is intended for domestic use, consumed on site or within the immediate local community Amend CAP Promote Area to include reference to TAG No changes to 'glare of solar panels' on page 25, 'ever-aging population' on page 52, 'aerial view' on page 60, Highgreen on page 49.</p>