

Page numbers relate to the previous comments from  
Planning Policy Committee 20 February 2017, Appendix 1

Additional comments	KKP response	Amendment and relevant page number
Page 12 comment Spencer Road/Hayway allotments are referred to, but that is one man's private allotment. We cannot include a personal garden. If we did we would have to include anyone else who had a vegetable patch in their garden. This is supposed to be evaluating public open space- it is not public if only 1 person owns and works it. Should be removed.	Site removed on this basis.	P44 and others to reflect change
Page 5 re Rushden and Diamonds AFC. I understand that R&D AFC run 18 teams. Their first Team are about to relocate from the Dog & Duck in Wellingborough back to Rushden. However several of their teams have always played in East Northants	Our previous response/comments state this, and the report reflects this situation.	n/a
Page 6 My comment about the new 3G pitch at Spencer Park stands. If KKP had had a meeting with the Clerk at Rushden Town Council they would have been told about this. To be told to engage with the FA is an insult as Town Councillors have already done this	Our previous comments do not suggest to engage with the FA.  Our previous comments refer to the FA model used within the report.	n/a
Page 9 First item. KKP should meet with the Rushden TC Clerk to ensure that their report is correct.	A meeting will be arranged with the Rushden Town Council Clerk to ensure that the report is correct.	n/a
Allotments at Alexandra Rd. Refer to the Town Clerk or the Secretary of the Allotment Society. Still needs correcting	The allotment society identifies 3 sites (all are included in the study);	n/a

Page numbers relate to the previous comments from  
Planning Policy Committee 20 February 2017, Appendix 1

Additional comments	KKP response	Amendment and relevant page number
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quorn Road</li> <li>- Highfield Road</li> <li>- Bedford Road</li> </ul> <p>In addition, a site off Grafton Road (near to Alexandra Road) is also included.</p>	
Page 9 Page 48 comment still needs correcting	Amended	See very first comment above
Capacity of Rushden cemetery is NOT 10 years. Check with Town Clerk, she will say 5	At the time of the meeting we were informed it was 10. We have updated to reflect more recent information.	Now amended to 5.p54
Population Figures. We know that these are wrong because they do not take any effect of the SUE. They should make a statement to the effect that there are reasons for updating the national statistics.	Added a note to reflect situation.	P19 OS standards P33 PPS Assessment
Page 11. If the Rushden Town Council study has not been received, efforts should have been made to obtain a copy.	Noted	n/a
Maps used are out of date following parish boundary review. Specifically affects Chelveston/Raunds boundary.	Maps are in process of being updated	TBC
<b>Allotments report at 8.3:</b> Following the change of catchment area of the Chelveston allotments (not listed), HFTC now provides details of its waiting list when vacancies arise that can't be filled from within Chelveston. Two Higham residents now	Added site in Chelveston to report.	P44, 46, 47, 49 And p24 of Standards

Page numbers relate to the previous comments from  
Planning Policy Committee 20 February 2017, Appendix 1

Additional comments	KKP response	Amendment and relevant page number
<p>have plots in Chelveston. Potentially Chelveston could expand to provide a further 8 plots.</p> <p>For the past six or seven years, Chelveston Parish have hosted and overseen the ENC 'authorised' allotments which are at the curtilage of the Village. More recently, residents of Higham Ferrers have been invited to apply for a Plot. It would seem to make sense to have the Open space document reflect the most up to date Allotment situation</p>		paper
<p>Identifies only Irthlingborough war memorial – I would imagine Rushden would claim they had one, as would Chelveston, Higham, etc.</p> <p>We have an issue here where only 1 civic space has been identified. What was the reason for this? Is it better to not have any identified than just one, as the district clearly has more than one civic space.</p>	Agree, we have removed the section on this basis.	Whole report to reflect change.
Check footnotes in reports have correct date on.	Amended date of PPS Assessment report to reflect when NGBs signed off	