



Planning Policy Committee – 24 January 2011

The Raunds Masterplan

Purpose of report

This report summarises the feedback received following a period of public consultation on the Raunds Masterplan (Consultation Draft). In response, a number of changes are proposed. This report seeks the Committee's approval for the proposed changes and delegation of final approval of the document to a working group of Raunds Councillors and Planning Policy Councillors.

Attachment(s)

Appendix 1: Raunds Masterplan Consultation Feedback Summary.

1.0 Background

1.1 At the Planning Policy Committee on 22 November 2010, Councillors were presented with an update on the Raunds Masterplan and agreed that, due to time constraints, a steering group of Raunds Councillors and Planning Policy Councillors would approve the public consultation to take place on the draft document. The public consultation was approved and ran from 6 December 2010 to 4 January 2011.

2.0 Overview of the consultation

2.1 Letters of notification were sent to stakeholders and the consultation was advertised in the Nene Valley News and the Council's website. In addition, flyers and posters were distributed around the town. Hard copies of the document were also made available to view at East Northamptonshire Council offices, Rushden and Oundle Service Centres, Raunds Town Council and libraries around the district.

2.2 A total of 28 responses were received, which ranged from general support for the document, to more specific comments and suggestions. In addition to the proposed changes arising from consultation feedback, a small number of factual and clarity issues are also proposed by officers, in order to make the document clearer. Comments, proposed responses and changes are set out in Appendix 1.

2.3 It is anticipated that the final revised Masterplan will be prepared and published by the end of February 2011.

3.0 Equality and Diversity Implications

3.1 No Equalities Impact Assessment is required.

4.0 Legal Implications

4.1 There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

5.0 Risk Management

5.1 There are no identified risks arising from this proposal.

6.0 Financial implications

6.1 There are no financial implications arising from the proposals.

7.0 Corporate Outcomes

7.2 The Masterplan supports priority outcomes set out in the Corporate Plan; including specifically:

- Improved market towns
- High quality built environment

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 The Committee is recommended to:

- (1) Agree the proposed changes to the draft as set out in Appendix 1 (*Reason – in response to feedback received from the public consultation and to make the document clearer*)
- (2) Delegate approval of the final Masterplan to a working group of Raunds Councillors and Planning Policy Councillors.

Legal	Power: Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004				
	Other considerations:				
Background Papers:	Committee Report – 22 November 2010 Committee Minutes – 22 November 2010 (Minute 284) The Raunds Masterplan Consultation Draft (6 December 2010)				
Person Originating Report:	Hayley Blundell – Design Officer Extn: 2351 hblundell@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk				
Date: 6 January 2011					
CFO		MO		CX	

(Committee Report Normal Rev. 22)

Appendix 1

Summary of responses on the draft Raunds Masterplan

Response Number	Ref.	Name	Section of document to which comment refers	Comment	Response	Action
1	(i)	Neil Harvey	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Brownfield development would only provide a small percentage of the proposed 500 dwellings.	Acknowledged, as highlighted in page 57, para 6.4. Reference to 'infill' in this paragraph could however be amended to 'brownfield' to ensure consistency of language and understanding.	Change word 'infill' to 'brownfield' in paragraph 6.4.
	(ii)		Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Location of sites may add to traffic congestion in the town centre.	Noted. This is one of the matters which will be tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan, which will seek to allocate sites for development.	No further action required
	(iii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Land north of Brick Kiln Lane was originally preferred because of its accessibility to the A45, so causing minimum traffic nuisance to the town. None of the other sites can do this.	Noted. Traffic impact is one of the issues which will require further testing in the development of statutory policy.	No further action required
	(iv)		Page 52 - Integrating open space	Have big concerns about the proposed ponds at various locations.	Noted. Please see comments of the Environment Agency below (number 26)	No further action required

	(v)	Pages 54-55 - Regenerating the High Street	Opening up Hogs Dyke would be of concern e.g. health and safety and fly tipping.	Noted. Please see comments of the Environment Agency below (number 26), which are generally supportive of this principle. Detailed design to mitigate concerns raised around health and safety and fly tipping will need to be carefully considered, however this is beyond the scope of the Masterplan which sets out strategic principles and recommendations.	No further action required
	(vi)	General comment	I have many concerns about the report, but overall I think it is a fair and unbiased report.	Noted	No further action required
2	(i)	Mr and Mrs Moat Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	The 'integrated with the town centre' comment does not adequately deal with the 500m walking zone discussed at the workshops.	Noted. The wording of this design principle has wider application than simply walking distance. However the absence of walking 'zones' is noted from the document, and could usefully be added.	Indicate walking zones on appropriate maps
	(ii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Any greenfield development should be within the walking zone otherwise new residents will drive and compound the traffic problems.	It is agreed that as a general principle new development should ideally be within walking distance of key facilities for the reason stated, and this could be worded more clearly within section 5.9.	Reflect preference for developments to be within reasonable walking distance of key facilities where possible.

(iii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Without the walking zone circles from Town Square, Manor School and Windmill School added to the dispersed evenly criteria the Masterplan leaves the door open to push far into greenfield. This was a substantial discussion at the workshops which is oversimplified by the report's use of the word 'integrated'.	As above. Such circular 'zones' could be usefully plotted. However it should be noted that they can only be indicative, and do not take account of topography, which affects walking speeds and the distances which people are prepared to walk. It would be inappropriate for such tools to be used to restrict development, albeit that accessibility to key community facilities would be a consideration in the planning process.	Indicate walking zones on appropriate maps
(iv)		The whole concept of viability is too overstated and suggests undue pressure. Most if not all previous developments have clearly been viable and were all up to 100 houses.	The consultant brief for the Raunds Masterplan requires financial viability to be considered when making any recommendations for future development in Raunds. This is to ensure that any recommendations are realistic and do not raise public expectations for proposals which are unlikely to be achievable in practice. The Masterplan is being drafted in the current economic climate, although it is accepted that this may change over time.	Clarify the reasons viability is taken into account.

(v)	<p>If the report is attempting to suggest that substantially more S106 monies can be obtained from large scale development at the same time as telling them they have to build 40% affordable housing, this does not add up as viable.</p>	<p>The target for up to 40% of larger residential developments to be affordable housing is set out in Policy 15 of the adopted Core Spatial Strategy. The wording of this Policy does not specifically set out that viability should be taken into account, however national guidance does.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(vi)	<p>Cites Milton Keynes tariff as a way of obtaining contributions from smaller developments</p>	<p>Noted. The North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit is currently reviewing means by which developer contributions can be achieved, including via Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However it is beyond the scope of the Masterplan to consider this issue.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

(vii)

There is no point enshrining the town wishes for dispersed and evenly distributed development to then go on to recommend developments of 200-300 units sites as paragraph 6.6. This would result in undue pressure later on in the plan period to build more. This would not meet the workshop objective for steady natural growth to match the previous 15 years.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(viii)	<p>The map of conceptual locations for housing growth on page 56 must enshrine the 3x 500m walking zones (Town Square, Manor School and Windmill School) to limit how far into greenfield the developers can push. Extremely unhappy that the idea of restricting growth in this way has been lost.</p>	<p>As above. Such circular 'zones' could be usefully plotted. However it should be noted that they can only be indicative, and do not take account of topography, which affects walking speeds and the distances which people are prepared to walk. It would be inappropriate for such tools to be used to restrict development, albeit that accessibility to key community facilities would be a consideration in the planning process.</p>	<p>Indicate walking zones on appropriate maps</p>
(ix)	<p>The masterplan must go some way to define draft revision to the Town settlement boundaries.</p>	<p>This matter is beyond the scope of the masterplan, and will instead be considered as part of the development of the four Towns Plan.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(x)	<p>Viability work indicates that development of at least 200 homes may be required on each site, limiting the number of sites required to 2 over the Masterplan period. The report in no way explains or justifies the 'viability' argument, and therefore overrides the wishes for smaller and more dispersed developments.</p>	<p>Agree that it would be useful to clarify this conclusion within the Masterplan</p>	<p>Clarify viability conclusions</p>

(xi)

Page 9 - landowners. Very concerned that landowners visions influences the plan. Landowners want to make money regardless of the consequences for the town.

Landowners and developers are stakeholders in Raunds as defined by the Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment (PFBE), which developed the Enquiry by Design process. They are likely to have a role in delivering the aspirations and objectives of the Masterplan. As such, it is important that they are involved in the process, and indeed some have expressed concern that they have not had sufficient involvement in the process (see 10(xix)). It is noted however that text on page 9 does not clearly describe the nature of the input from developers.

Amend wording to reflect nature of the discussions between AECOM and land owners / developers.

(xii)

Page 10 para 1.12 - what is this saying?

There is a typographical error in this paragraph which needs to be corrected - 'con' should read 'consensus'. In essence, the paragraph acknowledges that there was not universal agreement that growth in Raunds was necessary amongst all stakeholders and local residents. However, the stakeholders did reach broad consensus around a projection of 500 homes based on historic house completions in the town. The text could be amended however to clarify this further.

Revisit the text in this paragraph to try and make the meaning clearer, including correcting the typographical error.

(xiii)	Page 21 para 2.46 - land south of Meadow Lane should be kept for housing (not B1, B2). The B1 and B2 allocation should be north of Brick Kiln Road.	This section of the Masterplan document considers the existing evidence base, and paragraph 2.46 is specifically referring to a recommendation in the East Northamptonshire Employment Land Review (2006). This is not an explicit recommendation of the Masterplan, and is not referenced under section 5.10 which sets out site specific design principles for land south of Meadow Lane. It is not however precluded by the Masterplan either.	No further action required
(xiv)	Page 25 - the inclusion within the town Masterplan of the landowners 'marketing' perceptions of their plans is unacceptable for all paragraphs.	Para. 2.63 clearly states that the role of the Masterplan is not to promote or assess these sites. However, in order to provide a transparent and comprehensive Masterplan, all current relevant information about any land owner interest in the area i.e details of current planning applications etc are provided "for information only".	A further sentence should be added to further clarify that these details are provided "for information only".
(xv)	Para 2.67 bullet one would mislead the average reader into believing that the Darsdale proposal complies with the Raunds Area Plan, it does not.	Noted. Paragraph 2.67 highlights that this description has been put forward by the developer. As set out under paragraphs 2.63-2.65, the Masterplan does not assess nor promote individual land owner interests.	No further action required

(xvi)	Para 2.67 bullet 6 - suggests their (Darsdale) development is close to the town centre. At its extreme it is nearly a mile away.	Noted. Paragraph 2.67 highlights that this description has been put forward by the developer. As set out under paragraphs 2.63-2.65, the Masterplan does not assess nor promote individual land owner interests.	No further action required
(xvii)	Para 6.27 bullet 7 - disagree that the Darsdale development would minimise impact on the countryside.	Noted. Paragraph 2.67 highlights that this description has been put forward by the developer. As set out under paragraphs 2.63-2.65, the Masterplan does not assess nor promote individual land owner interests.	No further action required
(xviii)	Page 32 para 4.2 - dispersal should be even around the town.	This is a principle established within the Masterplan, albeit that viability considerations are cited as a reason why this may occur over a longer period of time.	No further action required
(xix)	Page 34 - Two 100 house developments should yield the same S106 payments as a 100 house development.	Noted. The North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit is currently reviewing means by which developer contributions can be achieved, including via Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – which has set scales of contribution per house. The government has indicated that it intends CIL to replace S106 contributions by 2014 for all contributions except those relating to Affordable Housing.	No further action required

(xx)

Conceptual circles indicating where housing be located in compliance with the primary objective of evenly dispersed development may mislead in terms of the southern area. Whatever housing units the RPC site can provide is part of the southern area quota, NOT in addition to. This was conceded by discussion groups especially as most development in recent years had been on the southern side of Raunds.

There is a current planning application on the RPC site for residential development. At the current time the RPC site is not allocated for development, and if the application is approved it would constitute a windfall development site. It is therefore unlikely that it would contribute to achieving the housing target. In addition, it should be noted that in considering the amount of development in any one area of the town, significant emphasis must be placed on responding to the opportunities and constraints of the area. Further work will be carried out on this through the development of the Four Towns Plan.

No further action required

3

(i)

Trudy Anderson

Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites

No opposition to development of housing on the RPC site, but houses should be laid out to enhance a sense of community.

Noted. Detailed arrangement of the site is a material planning consideration, but is beyond the scope of the Masterplan.

No further action required

(ii)

Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites

Job prospects are poor - needs to be considered.

Section 2 of the document sets out the current position, whilst recommendations include potential ways of enhancing the local employment offer.

No further action required

(iii)	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Where would Titty Ho Garage go? Not on Greenfield I hope!	This is one of the issues which makes the deliverability of this site within the plan period uncertain. Whilst noted as a potential site therefore, further work would need to be done to assess its potential.	No further action required
(iv)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Please do not build on greenfield sites. These need to be preserved at all costs - once gone they can't be replaced. Lots of wild kite depend on this area.	The preference to develop brownfield sites is acknowledged in the Masterplan, and has been a long established planning principle. However, the desire to protect greenfield land, has to be balanced against other considerations, including housing need and the desire to reduce out commuting to work.	No further action required
(v)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Why do we need to build up to the bypass? It looks unsightly and must be detrimental to the health of residents that live next to it.	The Masterplan explores ways in which future development might be accommodated. The diagram on page 56 identifies potential employment sites adjacent to the A45, but not housing. Visual impact of any proposals would however need to be carefully considered.	No further action required
(vi)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	There could be potential in developing off Brick Kiln Lane (limited capacity to 50 houses max), but retain the allotments, football club etc.	Noted. The document does not propose the removal of the football club or the allotments	No further action required

(vii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	200 houses total is plenty - but still need investment in health centre and social housing for the elderly.	Section 2 of the document sets out the current evidence base in relation to health services etc, including the funding requirements for improving existing facilities.	No further action required
(viii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Please limit the number of warehouse type as there are numerous empty warehouses in Northamptonshire already.	Noted. The demand for new warehouses would be considered as part of any proposal.	No further action required
(ix)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Small workshop type developments - good.	Noted	No further action required
(x)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	No opposition to 20mph zones near schools, but that is all that is needed - no humps please.	Noted. Speed humps are not currently proposed in the Masterplan.	No further action required
(xi)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	There is currently nowhere to lock up push bikes in Raunds.	Agree. It would be useful to highlight the need for cycle storage key areas within the town and identify where storage facilities would be useful as part of the strategy to make access to the town centre easier.	1) Highlight need for cycle storage 2) Identify potential areas for cycle storage 3) Identify requirement as part of the Action Plan
(xii)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Do not move the chicane on Marshall's Road -waste of money and time.	Noted. Bullet 10 on page 50 does suggest consideration be given moving the existing bus stop and chicane with a view to improving access to the Marshall's Road car park. It does highlight however that this may not be feasible. Any future proposals for street improvements would need to look at feasibility and cost, and be weighed against any benefit.	No further action required

	(xiii)		Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	Marshall Road surgery needs a radical overhaul - redevelopment and more access.	Bullet 3 on page 52 identifies the need for improvements at Marshall's Road surgery.	No further action required
	(xiv)		Page 52 - Integrating Open Space	Make more pleasant features of our stream areas - landscape them!	This aspiration is reflected in Environmental principle 'ESE' on page 35. However this is not referenced within this section of the Masterplan. Reference to this matter here would be helpful.	Include some comment on how the stream areas could be enhanced and integrated with open spaces.
	(xv)		Page 52 - Integrating Open Space	Need to consider teenagers - give them somewhere warm and welcoming to go.	Para 2.19 and the Action Plan "community facilities" recognise this issue.	No further action required
	(xvi)			Can only see maximum potential for 200 homes - small areas not solid blocks of development - only on brownfield sites please.	This type of scenario was considered as part of the recent workshops. It was broadly concluded that this scenario would not be sufficient to address some of the other objectives of the Masterplan, and as such was discounted.	No further action required
4	(i)	Mrs T Edwards	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Small infill sites should be monitored to ensure good design that fits in with the surroundings.	Quality of design and relationship with surroundings are material considerations in the planning process. As such, they would form part of the assessment of any proposal as a matter of course at the planning stage.	No further action required

(ii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Concerned about 'large scale' development on land east of Mountbatten Way, due to traffic impacts. Also, to encourage any more vehicular movements outside the school, would adversely affect pedestrian safety. Traffic issues in this area are compounded in icy conditions.	Noted. The Masterplan does identify land to the east of the town in line with the principle of dispersing development. Traffic impact would be one area where further assessment would be required.	No further action required
(iii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Large warehouses are unsightly and take up large areas of land, but often have few people working in them.	Noted. Visual impact would need to be considered and assessed as part of any planning proposal, as would job creation.	No further action required
(iv)	Pages 54-55 - Regenerating the High Street	Concerned about a shared surface in the Market Square - it would result in confusion and nobody knowing who's right of way it is. Clearly defined vehicle and pedestrian space is far safer.	Noted. The Masterplan suggests that there would be scope for some improvement, though the design of this would need to be considered in greater detail, and in consultation with the community, at a later date. This is to be taken forward in the Action Plan.	No further action required
(v)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Agree in general, though careful consideration of all new developments must be made, rather than rushing plans through and getting it wrong in the long term.	Noted.	No further action required
(vi)	General comments	I feel that much of this consultation has been positive, and agree with many of the final conclusions.	Noted	No further action required
(vii)		One concern is the density of development - it is important not to crowd people in like cattle as this only results in bad feeling and negativity.	Noted. The Masterplan highlights preferences expressed for lower densities.	No further action required

5	(i)	North Raunds Residents Association	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Housing development should take place over 4 sites and not concentrated on one or two areas of the town.	<p>Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.</p>	Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.
---	-----	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

(ii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	(Strongly agree) subject to possible development on Warth Park as recently reported in the local paper.	Proposed development at Warth Park is highlighted on page 27 of the document, where it is noted that community consultation and discussions with Council officers are ongoing.	No further action required.
(iii)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Clear direction signs including an indication of opening hours in respect of Saxon Hall car park. Opening hours to be extended (currently closed before 5pm).	Noted. This is beyond the scope of the Masterplan, but feedback will be shared with Raunds Town Council.	No further action required on the Masterplan

(iv)

Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations

If 500 homes or 800 (as per the Core Spatial Strategy), or any other number are to be provided, it is important that these are distributed evenly over the selected sites.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

	(v)		General comments	The Raunds masterplan is generally accepted by NRRRA as being a fair indication of what is required by the people of Raunds. It is clear that what is not required is a single massive housing development on a Greenfield site in the form of a 'carbuncle' on the periphery of the town.	Noted.	No further action required
6	(i)	Alan Roberts	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Development of the London Road allotments and the pocket park were suggested. Why are they left out?	Potential development of the London Road allotments and the pocket park were raised and discussed at the stakeholder workshops. This information was also presented at the evening public meetings (with a view to relocating these facilities). Feedback received suggested significant opposition to developing these existing community facilities, and they have not therefore been recommended within the masterplan. The diagram on page 43 highlights that the pocket park has been excluded, although it fails to identify the London Road allotment site, and this should be amended. Agree that reasons for excluding these sites are not clearly explained within the document and additional reference would clarify this decision.	1) Identify that London Road allotments were considered as part of the process on the diagram on page 43. 2) Provide a brief summary on or near to page 43 about why 'excluded infill sites' have been so for clarity.

(ii)

Pages 46-48 -
Greenfield
development sites

Dispersed growth is required (5.8) whatever the volume of housing. Large separated estates would ruin Raunds and are definitely not wanted.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This figure is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(iii)

Pages 48-49 -
Employment sites

New housing development does not need to incorporate any more industrial/office space. There are sufficient sites in and around Raunds for future expansion.

The Masterplan explores and recommends various potential locations for commercial development.

No further action required

7	(i)	Mrs S Roberts	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Spread the housing around	<p>This principle is established in the document. The result of further testing however is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.</p> <p>Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.</p>
---	-----	------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------	---

8	(i)	Mrs Eileen Stubbs	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	The housing should be spread over the four sites, and not concentrated in one or two areas of the town.	<p>Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.</p>	Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.
---	-----	-------------------	--	---	--	--

- | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|---|
| (ii) | Pages 48-49 -
Employment sites | The recently reported Warth Park development should be taken into account. | The land interests from Warth Park did discuss their draft proposals with AECOM as part of the Masterplanning process. Reference is made to this on page 27. Potential future expansion at Warth Park is also identified on the diagram on page 43. | No further action required. |
| (iii) | Pages 50 - 51 -
Connecting the town | Signs for car park at Saxon Hall, and opening hours should be longer. | Noted. This is beyond the scope of the Masterplan, but this feedback will be shared with Raunds Town Council. | No further action required with regard to the Masterplan. |

(iv)

Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations

Whatever number of homes be provided, it is important that these are distributed evenly over the selected sites.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

	(v)		General comments	We do not require two large housing sites, one at one end and one at the other (north and south will not do). The brownfield sites must be used first.	This is not a recommendation of the Masterplan, which also seeks to emphasise the community's preference for brownfield development, and for any greenfield development to be dispersed.	No further action required
9	(i)	Mr A Hutchison	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Reference to allotments on London Road and the pocket park are omitted as potential brownfield sites. They are both surrounded by existing housing and any development thereon would be capable of rapid assimilation within the town. Both of these facilities could be re-sited and improved upon.	Potential development of the London Road allotments and the pocket park were raised and discussed at the stakeholder workshops (with a view to relocating these facilities). This information was also presented at the evening public meetings. Feedback received suggested significant opposition to developing these existing community facilities, and they have not therefore been recommended within the masterplan. The diagram on page 43 highlights that the pocket park has been excluded, although it fails to identify the London Road allotment site, and this should be amended. Agree that reasons for excluding these sites are not clearly explained within the document and additional reference would clarify this decision.	1) Identify that London Road allotments were considered as part of the process on the diagram on page 43. 2) Provide a brief summary on or near to page 43 about why 'excluded infill sites' have been so for clarity.

(ii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	The land south of Darsdale Farm amounts to "Raunds Empty Quarter" and being close to the town's retail spine is an ideal site for early change of use. Such use should encompass Parkland/housing/vineyard, in order to avoid a Limestone Quarry at all costs.	Noted.	No further action required
(iii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	The obvious has been omitted, which is the need to promote retail outlets involving direct 'person to person' contact and circumventing computer use. "Eating out" is widely held as middle class pass time and 20+ "Foodie" television programmes are screened daily. It follows that a Restaurant Quarter is called for to encourage small operations into the catering business and bring money in from outside the town.	The Masterplan does not recommend using a specific area for restaurants, however the principles within would generally support development of this type.	No further action required
(iv)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Spinney Hill is an ideal site for a car park between the Square to the north and the Co-op to the south. Clever design could combine parking, terraced gardens and a lake. In addition, this vital facility could have a separate entrance and exit.	The Masterplan makes recommendations for Spinny Hill to be improved for accessibility to the town centre. There was broad consensus on this approach at the recent workshops.	No further action required
(v)	Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	AECOM have failed to record the detail. The suggestion that a Town Forum is established on the War Memorial site has been disregarded in favor of the many irrelevancies, and formula solutions.	Specific recommendations and proposals for individual sites including the War Memorial site are noted but are beyond the more strategic visioning role of the masterplan document. Reference to aspirations to improve this site could however be noted under the 'integrating open space design guidelines'.	Refer to local aspiration for the improvement of the War Memorial site

(vi)	Page 52 - Integrating Open Space	Comments are very fair and indeed the town should make the most of what it has before spending money on innovation.	Noted	No further action required
(vii)	Page 52 - Integrating Open Space	The reference to retention ponds was puzzling due to the lack of watercourses.	Retention ponds are used as a method of Sustainable Urban Drainage, and are not necessarily related to watercourses.	No further action required
(viii)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	It could be said that the entire report is based on a formula structure that could be applied to any number of Midland towns.	This document has been developed specifically for Raunds, in discussion with local stakeholders and residents.	No further action required
(ix)		The development area north of Brick Kiln Road has expanded to the east since the public meetings, and now includes Northdale Farm in part.	This area is indicative only, to demonstrate the principle of dispersed development. It is not possible to allocate specific sites as part of the Masterplan. Instead this will need to be tested and developed through statutory policy.	No further action required
(x)	General comments	Raunds Townsfolk should be grateful for ENC's and AECOM's effort as the entire exercise succeeded in concentrating some 100 minds on Raunds' medium and long term problems.	Noted.	No further action required
(xi)		That said, it is a shame that many of the individual suggestions made have not been specifically recorded or classified (however they may have been "off the wall!!"). They may have proved to be of value in the future.	The document attempts to capture information on which there was broad consensus.	No further action required

10	(i)	Richard Serra on behalf of Barwood Land and Estates Ltd (not on questionnaire format)	General comments	Having regard to the status of the Masterplan document, comments have been limited to those set out within the letter. The absence of comment on other parts of the document does not signify assent to either the approach adopted or the conclusions reached.	Noted	No further action required
	(ii)			Barwood is a substantial landowner and is currently promoting a sustainable addition to the northern edge of Raunds.	Noted	No further action required
	(iii)			Although locally informed and shaped, Barwood Land is concerned that the Raunds Masterplan has not been informed by the physical, ownership, legal and policy constraints and opportunities which exist locally, in an attempt to steer its outcome in a particular direction - this will present a missed opportunity for the town.	There was no attempt to steer the plan in any particular direction. The Masterplan represents a summary of issues discussed by local stakeholders and residents, on which some broad consensus was reached. The Masterplan is not a statutory planning document, but is a piece of evidence which will be considered alongside other work and studies in the development of future planning policies.	Add a statement to clarify the status of the Masterplan
	(iv)			Barwood supports the objectives on page 29, which are considered to correlate strongly to those underpinning the Northdale End and wider SUE proposals.	Noted	No further action required

(v)	Supports the draft Masterplan in so far as it reaffirms the principle of employment and residential development and well connected green spaces on the northern edge of Raunds. A table summarises the masterplan principles which correlate with Northdale End.	Noted	No further action required
(vi)	Barwood Land does object to some elements of the masterplan, primarily on the basis of an inadequate acknowledgement of the development plan context. Also because there is insufficient or inadequate evidence to substantiate certain assumptions in the document.	The Masterplan represents a summary of issues discussed by local stakeholders and residents, on which some broad consensus was reached. The Masterplan is not a statutory planning document, but is a piece of evidence which will be considered alongside other work and studies in the development of future planning policies. The introduction states the planning policy context for the Masterplan.	No further action required

(vii)

Housing targets - the assumption that Raunds will need to accommodate around 500 new homes over the next 15 years is an arbitrary and unsubstantiated assumption. The Masterplan must recognise the existing development plan context. The Core Spatial Strategy identifies a target of 1,100 new homes in Raunds, which is translated to 880 to take into account subsequent completions. The Masterplan must be predicated on this figure to carry any legitimacy or relevance.

The Raunds Masterplan is intended to be a piece of evidence which will be a consideration in the direction of future policy in relation to Raunds. One of the ways it may be used is in discussing revisions to the adopted North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, which is currently under review. It is however acknowledged that the adopted Core Spatial Strategy currently remains the strategic policy framework which guides development in Raunds, and sets out the current housing targets. It should be noted however that the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit has already published proposals to extend the current housing targets over a longer period of time to 2028. This proposal was accepted by ENC's Planning Policy Committee on 22 November 2010. As such, the annual indicative housing requirement for Raunds is likely to be decreased, albeit necessarily to the level suggested in the Masterplan.

Wording with regard to the status and purpose of the Masterplan is to be added at the beginning of the document.

(viii)	Barwood objects to the masterplan principle contained within paragraph 4.18 that new housing should be larger housing for families and high earners. This is inconsistent with national policies of building balanced communities with an appropriate range of housing types and tenures.	The Masterplan recognises the local desire that larger properties should be encouraged (Principle HOC para. 4.7). However, this does not require all new development to be large housing, and as the respondent rightly highlights, that approach would obviously be inconsistent with national policy.	No further action required
(ix)	One of the key outputs of the process is the identification of several pieces of brownfield land within Raunds. Whilst the document seeks to prioritise development of these sites, it does not consider the viability or practicalities of developing these sites. As such, these should not be relied upon to contribute to the housing targets. They should not therefore be 'allocated' sites within the Masterplan, but rather should be left to emerge as windfall sites as they prove deliverable.	The document indeed does not make a full assessment of the constraints of these sites. Whilst it is a clear community aspiration to prioritise these sites, it is recognised that there practical reasons which may inhibit this. The Masterplan is not a site allocation Development Plan Document (DPD), and as such does not allocate sites. Instead potential allocations will be explored and tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required
(x)	The alternative approach to the above would be to undertake a much more thorough examination of the deliverability of these sites, though this would be more appropriate for a statutory development plan document.	Agreed. As identified above, this will be done through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required

(xi)	<p>Whilst Barwood Land understands (but does not agree with) the rationale behind the approach for spreading greenfield development around the town, it ignores key pieces of evidence that have already been produced in assessing areas for future development in Raunds - including The Raunds Area Preferred Options document and its evidence base the Sustainable Urban Extensions Study (2006). This was the subject of extensive public consultation.</p>	<p>The principle of dispersed development is a clear aspiration of the local community, as reflected in the Masterplan. The Masterplan itself is not a statutory planning document, but rather will form a piece of community led evidence which will be tested and considered in developing the Four Towns Plan.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(xii)	<p>The Raunds Area Preferred Options adopted an evidence based approach. The masterplan on the other hand appears to have been shaped by a desire to defeat the Northdale End development proposals at appeal, rather than by a proper consideration of relevant policy constraints and the evidence as to which locations best meet them.</p>	<p>The intention of the Masterplan is to build broad community consensus around a vision for the town, which might inform future policy choices. This encompasses a wide range of issues as identified in the document. The Masterplan does not assess any existing planning proposals.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(xiii)	<p>In respect of greenfield land, developments need to fulfill the criteria of Policy 16 of the adopted CSS. Those schemes promoted to the south and west of Raunds fail the criteria of this policy as they are simply housing developments. As the Masterplan ought to be consistent with the development plan then it stands to reason that both these sites should not be considered as suitable greenfield development.</p>	<p>Noted. The masterplan is clear that it makes no assessment of current planning proposals. Indicative areas for potential development identified within the Masterplan do not constitute allocations at this stage. They will need to be further tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

(xiv)

The draft masterplan rightly seeks to address the acknowledged issue of out commuting and employment provision in Raunds. It however appears to ignore the Strategic Employment Land Assessment (SELA), and instead places unnecessary emphasis on the expansion of Warth Park, with little in the way of new information as to why some of the conclusions of the SELA can now be set aside. Barwood Land questions why the Masterplan suggests further development at Warth Park given identified constraints and instead believes that additional consideration should be given to Barwood's employment proposals.

Para. 2.48 highlights the 2006 study and that careful consideration should be given to the scale and type of development at Warth Park, due to proximity and relationship to Raunds. However, agree that para. 5.21 needs to be amended to highlight that Warth Park is not the only potential location and that there are opportunities north of the town.

Suggest final sentence of para 5.21 is amended to reflect that opportunities for provision are to the north and/or west of Raunds, as highlighted in the SELA (2009).

(xv)

Various technical reports produced in support of the Northdale End planning application and other documents were made available to AECOM. There is no indication that these documents have been considered.

Noted. All documents and information supplied by both Developers and stakeholders have been considered in the preparation of the Masterplan. Text in Introduction will be amended to briefly highlight that this has taken place.

Highlight within the introduction that additional information has been considered.

(xvi)

Paragraph 4.10 indicates a possibility of combined heat and power (CHP) and district heating systems having limited application in terms of new housing development because of the likely scale and density of any new housing. This is contrary to para 4.17 of the CSS, which identifies that through sufficient critical mass of development, environmental sustainability can be optimised.

Noted. Any development proposals would have to be assessed against current policies e.g The Adopted Core Strategy. The Masterplan reflects the broad community consensus reached on matters discussed in the workshops, including a preference for dispersed, small scale development. Para 4.10 just highlights that one of the implications of this is that opportunities for CHP are likely to be limited.

No further action required

(xvii)

Although the Masterplan is a non statutory document, it needs to reflect the principles of soundness outlined in PPS 12. It is particularly important that any assertions made within the Masterplan are supported by a strong evidence base.

The Masterplan does not form part of the statutory planning system. Should any part of it be taken forward into the development of the Four Towns Plan (or any subsequent statutory document) i.e the statutory planning system, then that element would need to be based on a strong evidence base and tested formally against PPS12 tests of soundness.

No further action required

	(xviii)		Having the masterplan as a vehicle for recording local views and preferences is neither a sound basis for forward planning nor an appropriate expression of the emerging 'localism agenda'.	The Enquiry by Design style approach is an established way of trying to build community consensus. The Masterplan document emerging from this process is not intended to become a statutory planning document in its own right, but rather a piece of evidence to feed into the development of the Four Towns Plan.	Insert wording regarding status and purpose of the document
	(xix)		Barwood Land believes that land owner and development participation has not adhered to the principles of Enquiry by Design. Barwood Land should clearly have been identified as a stakeholder, and afforded an opportunity to contribute through the stakeholder workshops. In addition there is no reporting on the discussions held with landowners/developers on day 2, which reinforces concern about the output of the process.	Land owners were identified as stakeholders. However, given very strong local views on various recent and current planning proposals, it was felt that the presence of land owners in the workshops would result in too much discussion about individual planning applications at the expense of taking the 'whole town' approach. Land owners were however invited to meet with AECOM to discuss the process, and have been kept informed throughout the consultation.	Further clarification to be made in the introduction (para 1.7) about developer interest into the process
	(xx)		Barwood Land nevertheless would like to play a key role in shaping this document.	Noted	No further action required
11	(i)	Mr and Mrs Allen	General comments All new buildings should be fitted with photovoltaic cells to generate electricity which will benefit the environment and save money.	It is agreed that methods on generating renewable energy are to be encouraged. However, this level of detail is not within the scope of this Masterplan.	No further action required

(ii)

General comments

It is unlikely that manufacturing will be attracted to Raunds, although its central location makes it ideal for warehouse and distribution businesses. Therefore it is unlikely that there will be any great increase in employment.

The Masterplan sets out the current position on pages 19-20, and identifies recommendations for enhancing the current employment offer based on available information. No further action required

12 (i)	Graham Underwood	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Development should take place over four sites, not concentrated on one site.	<p>Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.</p>	Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.
(ii)		Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Warth Park could be developed further	Draft proposals to extend Warth Park are set out on page 27 of the document.	No further action required

(iii)

Pages 56 - 57 Key
Recommendations

500 homes equally distributed around
Raunds.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(iv)		General comments	Housing expansion cannot be avoided but has to be sympathetic to Raunds and not in one area of the town. Also to include brownfield sites.	These principles are set out within the Masterplan.	No further action required.
13 (i)	Duncan Farrington	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Brownfield development should always be looked at first, but this should be balanced with the deliverability of successful economic development being met. Have potential developers been consulted on the viability of sites within Raunds?	Noted. Detailed viability testing/ assessments would be carried out during the statutory plan-making process i.e when the Four Towns Plan or subsequent planning policy documents are prepared.	No further action required.
(ii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	For the sustainable development of Raunds, greenfield development should happen. Please note on the final point of general design guidelines (Avoid Raunds and Stanwick merging within a strategic green area) - this should not inhibit the development of site 4 (Land south of Meadow Lane).	Noted. The principles and recommendations within the masterplan aim to maintain a strategic gap between Raunds and Stanwick. However an area to the east of Raunds is identified as a potential development site.	No further action required
(iii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Site 4 (Land south of Meadow Lane) supports all the guidelines, and is especially strong when compared to other sites; for example integration of new roads with existing, and alleviation of storm water run off affecting existing town.	Noted	No further action required
(iv)		Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Land south of Meadow Lane has the potential to support an area of commercial/B1 use adjacent to the Warth Park site, immediately south of Meadow Lane.	Noted.	No further action required

(v)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Development of land south of Meadow Lane will include an improved access junction onto London Road, and improved pedestrian access and links with the town centre and the amenity facilities at Stanwick Lakes.	Noted	No further action required
(vi)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	There is often an excess of vehicles parking at the Cottons surgery, over spilling onto Meadow Lane. There is potential for an overflow car park being designed into the development site south of Meadow Lane to alleviate this problem.	Noted	No further action required
(vii)	Page 52 - Integrating Open Space	Development of land south of Meadow Lane is integral to the wider enhancement of amenity green links between Raunds, Stanwick Lakes and the surrounding countryside and Nene Valley.	Noted	No further action required

(viii)

Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations

Whilst suggested that 2 out of the 4 sites should be endorsed, there is no mention of which of the sites can currently actually be delivered. If two are accepted, there needs to be some kind of strategy to ensure deliverability, with the other two sites being held in reserve.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(ix)		General comments	Of the four identified greenfield sites, land south of Meadow Lane is the only site that can currently deliver on all of the guidelines. The site allows flexibility in design to suit the needs of sustainable town growth and can accommodate the needs of the planning process.	Noted	No further action required
14 (i)	Marion Butson	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Further development would spoil Raunds' character and is not necessary.	Protecting the character of Raunds is one of the key objectives of the Masterplan (page 29, HO1). Whilst during the stakeholder workshops and the public meetings there was not universal agreement that growth was needed, there was a broad consensus that some change, including some growth is required.	No further action required
(ii)		Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Converting site A into additional car parking facilities would encourage more people to use the existing shops and the Co-op.	The need to look at a strategy to improve car parking within the town centre is identified within the Action Plan at the back of the document.	No further action required
(iii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Raunds does not require further development in relation to additional housing. Additional jobs can be provided by further development at Warth Park.	Noted. Different housing scenarios were considered through the workshop process, and there was broad consensus that 500 new houses was realistic and reasonable in the context of other objectives identified. Expansion of Warth Park is also noted for potential in in the document.	No further action required

(iv)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	As stated before, the existing Warth Park could be extended to provide additional jobs. However, Kettering, Wellingborough and Northampton are close enough and I do not feel that additional job opportunities in the immediate area are a necessity. If anything the current bus service to the above areas could be improved.	Noted. One of the identified issues facing Raunds at present is the level of outcommuting. Therefore job creation is intended as part of a strategy to help to reduce this issue.	No further action required
(v)	Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	Not required. Existing facilities could be improved if they are not spoilt by future development.	Agree that existing facilities should be improved where possible subject to finding appropriate funding streams. This is reflected in the Action Plan.	No further action required
(vi)	Pages 54-55 - Regenerating the High Street	Any regeneration to improve the High Street would be seen as a positive impact on the community.	Noted	No further action required
(vii)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Residential growth is not necessary in Raunds - current housing capacity is sufficient. Additional development would change Raunds in a negative way and the environment would suffer.	Protecting the character of Raunds is one of the key objectives of the Masterplan (page 29, HO1). Whilst during the stakeholder workshops and the public meetings there was not universal agreement that growth was needed, there was a broad consensus that some change, including some growth is required.	No further action required

(viii)		General comments	I am strongly opposed to any future housing development in Raunds wherever it would be, although further development on the existing Warth Park site to provide jobs if absolutely necessary would be a positive step forward in the current economic climate, and would provide opportunities for both Raunds and the outlying areas.	Protecting the character of Raunds is one of the key objectives of the Masterplan (page 29, HO1). Whilst during the stakeholder workshops and the public meetings there was not universal agreement that growth was needed, there was a broad consensus that some change, including some growth is required.	No further action required
15 (i)	Martin Palmer on behalf of Darsdale Farm Action Group (DFAG)	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	The masterplan sets out a framework within which potential growth of 500 homes COULD (not should) be considered.	Noted. This framework will need to be tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required
(ii)			Dwellings should be built on brownfield sites first where possible. Sites A-G, in addition to some modest infill should provide approximately 100-150 dwellings at least.	Noted, though the constraints of individual brownfield sites will need to be considered, to test the potential for these sites to come forward within the plan period. This however, is beyond the scope of the Masterplan.	No further action required
(iii)			It is not understood why the RPC development should safeguard a route to Darsdale Farm.	It is good planning practice to preserve movement connections to adjacent land. This in no way prejudices the outcome of the current planning application at Darsdale Farm, on which the Council is yet to make a decision.	No further action required

(iv)	<p>The continued references to viability are considered irrelevant to the benefit of the people of Raunds - indeed phrases such as 'achieve the required returns for the developer' show exactly that. There seems to be some false causality promulgated between large development and the benefit of Raunds in contradiction to the will of the stakeholders.</p>	<p>The consultant brief for the Raunds Masterplan requires financial viability to be considered when making any recommendations for future development in Raunds. This is to ensure that any recommendations are realistic and do not raise public expectations for proposals which are unlikely to be achievable in practice. The Masterplan is being drafted in the current economic climate, although it is accepted that this may change over time.</p>	<p>Clarify the reasons viability is taken into account.</p>	
(v)	<p>Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites</p>	<p>There is too much emphasis on the 'viability' question here again, which seems to fly in the face of the will of stakeholders to limit and distribute any medium scale development as a method of managing a larger number of houses. Paragraphs 5.11 to 5.14 inclusive discuss the drivers for developers to want larger developments, but this seems irrelevant to the good of Raunds as confirmed in paragraph 5.15</p>	<p>The consultant brief for the Raunds Masterplan requires financial viability to be considered when making any recommendations for future development in Raunds. This is to ensure that any recommendations are realistic and do not raise public expectations for proposals which are unlikely to be achievable in practice. The Masterplan is being drafted in the current economic climate, although it is accepted that this may change over time.</p>	<p>Clarify the reasons viability is taken into account.</p>

(vi)

It was agreed by all attending the Masterplan (workshops) that there would be no major development on greenfield sites, and that development should be equally spread north, south, east and west within walking distance of the Square and schools to minimise traffic impact and maximise access to the town centre.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(vii)

The agreement and understanding from the workshops was that if greenfield development is necessary then any residential development on the RPC site would be included in the southern quota. This was also ratified with Raunds Town Councilors who attended the workshops at a meeting on 13 December 2010.

There is a current planning application on the RPC site for residential development. At the current time the RPC site is not allocated for development, and if the application is approved it would constitute a windfall development site. It is therefore unlikely that it would contribute to achieving the housing target. In addition, it should be noted that in considering the amount of development in any one area of the town, significant emphasis must be placed on responding to the opportunities and constraints of the area. Further work will be carried out on this through the development of the Four Towns Plan.

(viii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	The marketing agent for the RPC site concludes that this site should be used for residential development. We do not understand page 49 last bullet in 5.17.	The existing national and local planning policy framework, place the regeneration of town centres, including Raunds as a high priority. Given the location of this site at the interface with the town centre, there would be an expectation that mixed use development should be considered first to support regeneration of the town centre. There is a current planning application for residential development on the RPC site which is yet to be determined.	No further action required
(ix)		Distribution warehouses do not seem to provide a good level of quality employment for the locality.	Noted. The Masterplan proposes to encourage a mix of different types of development, much of it on a relatively small scale, to enhance employment opportunities within the town.	No further action required
(x)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Walking distance circles from the Town Square and schools should be shown as agreed with Councilors present at the workshops.	Agree that these could be usefully indicated within the document.	Indicate walking circles on appropriate map(s)

(xi)	The vehicular link shown on Map 51 between Weighbridge Way and Darsdale Farm is incorrect. It was agreed that a vehicle link should be provided between the RPC site and Weighbridge Way.	The link shown on page 51 is intended to demonstrate how the potential development area identified could be accessed. The topography of the land where this area meets the RPC site is such that any vehicular connection is unlikely to be a realistic proposition.	No further action required
(xii)	Page 47 Bullet 5 says that a pedestrian link should be maintained from the RPC site through Darsdale Farm linking with the existing countryside footpath.	It is good practice to preserve movement connections to adjacent land, as a way of trying to ensure that is potentially well integrated into its surroundings now and in the future. This recommendation in no way prejudices the outcome of the current planning application at Darsdale Farm, on which the Council is yet to make a decision.	No further action required
(xiii)	Page 52 Bullet 8 - cycle tracks on pavements should not cross dwelling driveways, and pavement widths should be maintained or improved as mentioned in the draft report.	Noted. This is however a matter of detail, which is beyond the scope of the masterplan. This would need to be considered in consultation with the Local Highway Authority as new schemes are developed.	No further action required

(xiv)	Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	There is already green space where shown as potential - which needs to be protected.	It is assumed that this comment relates to the diagram on page 51, and the 'potential green space' identified on the indicative southern development area. This area of land is currently undeveloped, but is indicatively part of an area of development in the masterplan. The plan is indicating a requirement for new community open space in this area. It is acknowledged that there is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument in this area, which is likely to require some protection.	Indicate Scheduled Ancient Monument on plan as area of protection.
(xv)		The general statement that developments need not provide green spaces is a dangerous one and needs to be removed or very much modified. There needs to be limits/bounds on the relaxation of such a basic design principle. Developers could be forgiven for taking this as a green light to increase housing density unreasonably for this rural location.	Agreed. Each site must be considered on its own merits, in the context of its immediate surroundings and accessibility to open space. Whilst in some cases it may be appropriate to improve existing facilities, it may be appropriate in others to provide new open spaces. This needs to be reworded.	Reword the final bullet on page 53, so that it is not inferred that there is a presumption against provision of new open spaces.
(xvi)	Pages 54-55 - Regenerating the High Street	It is problematic to suggest that recently completed work in the town centre needs revision, however it cannot be denied that improvements are required. Additional design and consultation work would be required to develop detailed plans.	Noted. This level of detail is however beyond the scope of this document, and would need to be considered at a future date. It is identified within the Action Plan.	No further action required

(xvii)		Alternative travel plans would need to be developed to accommodate the Square closure proposal.	Noted. This level of detail is however beyond the scope of this document, and would need to be considered at a future date.	No further action required
(xviii)		The newly completed Zebra crossing outside the Council offices does seem to require improvement for safety's sake.	Noted. This is beyond the scope of the Masterplan, however we will share this feedback with the Local Highway Authority at the County Council.	No further action required on the Masterplan
(xix)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	The map requires 'extent to acceptable development' boundaries to be indicated.	It is beyond the scope of this document to define the extent of acceptable development in any area of the town. Rather, this will be tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan, which is intended to become the statutory site allocations Development Plan Document and will incorporate Raunds.	No further action required
(xx)		The map requires 'walking distance' circles from the school and Town Centre Square to be indicated	Agreed. Circles to indicate walking distances could usefully be incorporated onto the map.	Indicate walking zones on map
(xxi)		Strategies for responding to single overwhelmingly large development applications are required.	All applications submitted have to be considered within the current policy framework.	No further action required

(xxii)

Viability concepts with respect to the developers need to be discounted.

The consultant brief for the Raunds Masterplan requires financial viability to be considered when making any recommendations for future development in Raunds. This is to ensure that any recommendations are realistic and do not raise public expectations for proposals which are unlikely to be achievable in practice. The Masterplan is being drafted in the current economic climate, although it is accepted that this may change over time.

No further action required

(xxiii)

Reference to the 500 homes scenario are erroneous.

This was the scenario that achieved most consensus at the workshops

No further action required

(xxiv)

Please clarify which 2 of the 4 edge of town sites are referred to in paragraph 6.6. As far as can be seen, all the current proposals are at an early stage or in abeyance.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(xxv)		Paragraph 6.7 seems to indicate the ability to manipulate S106 formula beyond what is achievable in reality.	Noted. The Joint Planning Unit are currently reviewing the way in which developer contributions can be achieved, including S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).	No further action required
(xxvi)		The prospect of RPC development as an employment site appears at odds with 2 years effort by the current owners. It appears unrealistic to rely on this site for employment opportunities.	<p>The existing national and local planning policy framework, place the regeneration of town centres, including Raunds as a high priority. Given the location of this site at the interface with the town centre, there would be an expectation that mixed use development should be considered first to support regeneration of the town centre.</p> <p>There is a current planning application for residential development on the RPC site which is yet to be determined.</p>	No further action required
(xxvii)	General comments	This again is a difficult form to complete.	Noted	No further action required

16 (i)	Martin Page of DH Barford and Co, on behalf of the Reyner Children's Settlement Trust Fund (owns land on east side of Manor Farm)	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	We question the viability of option B given the substantial relocation costs. Furthermore brownfield development can make only a limited contribution to growth.	Acknowledged. The constraints of developing individual brownfield sites have not been explored in any detail, and it is accepted that these could have a significant bearing on if and when these sites might realistically become available for development. This would need to be further tested in the development of policy.	No further action required
(ii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	The principle of dispersed growth is supported as this involves a more manageable infrastructure investment. Site 2 would secure a well related and integrated development close to important community services and the opportunity to improve facilities at Manor School.	Noted	No further action required
(iii)		Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	The retention of economic and employment development in and close to the town centre should be encouraged as this helps to sustain the vitality and viability of the town centre.	Agreed. This is encouraged in the Masterplan.	No further action required
(iv)		Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	A major traffic generator is the 'school run' and therefore providing housing growth close to schools is sensible.	Noted	No further action required
(v)		Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	The expansion of Manor School and public facilities is supported and can be delivered in association with nearby housing growth within walking distance of the school.	Noted	No further action required

(vi)	General comments	Noting the reference to Manor Farm in paragraph 2.69, we would clarify that the proposal for 50 units was specifically presented as a potential scheme which could come forward in line with Area 3 in the 2007 Raunds Area Preferred Options. The consultation document refers for potential larger scale development, and we can confirm that the Trust is happy to work with the Council to bring forward a scheme that will meet the Site 3 guidelines identified in paragraph 5.10.	Noted	No further action required
17 (i)	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of RPC Containers Ltd (not in questionnaire format)	Comments are made in light of the current outline planning application reference 10/01753/OUT, which at the time of writing has not been determined.	Noted	No further action required
(ii)		Paragraph 2.63 onwards details current landowners interest in sites around Raunds. The application for residential development at the RPC Containers site has been omitted from this list. It is important that reference is made to this site to demonstrate that the site is available, and that the owners are committed to securing its redevelopment.	Noted and agreed that reference should be added.	Add reference to current proposals for the RPC site
(iii)		The identification of the RPC site as a potential infill housing site on the diagram on page 43 is supported.	Noted	No further action required

(iv)	<p>However, identification of the northern part of the site for potential employment use is not supported, and it is considered that there is limited evidence for this part of the masterplan.</p>	<p>This is based on the themes discussed during the workshops, where stakeholders and local residents wished to encourage employment in the town centre to support its regeneration. This area was identified as a possible location, due to close town centre proximity.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(v)	<p>Paragraph 5.5 sets out site specific design guidelines for the RPC Containers site. These are broadly supported, and have been worked into the planning application proposals in ways summarised.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(vi)	<p>It is not considered that guidance on the mix of uses is grounded on a robust evidence base and does not take into account market conditions, site clearance and remediation costs or deliverability considerations.</p>	<p>This is based on the themes discussed during the workshops, where stakeholders and local residents wished to encourage employment in the town centre to support its regeneration. This area was identified as a possible location, due to close town centre proximity.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(vii)	<p>Support paragraph 5.7. This is especially pertinent as previous consultation on the masterplan has highlighted a very strong preference from residents/consultees for as much new housing as possible to be delivered on brownfield sites.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

			(viii)	The site is not considered suitable for employment uses for a number of reasons which have been explored in detail in relation to the current planning application. Some are summarised here.	Noted	No further action required
			(ix)	It is recommended that chapter 5 paragraph 5.5 is amended to reflect the unsuitability of the site for office uses.	The recommendations of the masterplan reflect the consensus reached through the workshop process. This would however need to be further tested through development of statutory policy. It is noted that there is a current planning application on this site, which is yet to be determined.	No further action required
18	(i)	Rosemary Hildreth	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Building on sites A-G could provide approximately 100-150 dwellings, a quarter of the 500, if 500 is the target.	Noted. The constraints of individual sites have not been assessed as part of the Masterplan process and any more specific site designations would need to be considered through the statutory planning system e.g Four Towns Plan, rather than through the Masterplan.	No further action required
			(ii)	I do not see the application for the RPC site mentioned anywhere within the Masterplan.	Design principles for the RPC site are set out on page 44, although there is no reference to the current planning application, which is yet to be determined.	Add reference to the current RPC proposals under the section on 'Current land owner interests' from page 25.

(iii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Page 43 identifies four potential development areas of similar size on four sides of the town. These sites do not correspond to current planning application sites.	The masterplan is based on broad community consensus demonstrating a preference for less and more dispersed development. It is clear that this cannot correspond to current planning proposals.	No further action required
(iv)		Map on page 43 shows Mountbatten Drive - area 2 and RPC -area 3. The opposite is cited in text on page 46 (5.10)	Agreed. The map on page 43 should be amended.	Amend labels on diagram on page 43 to accurately label sites 2 and 3.
(v)		Paragraph 5.11 states how much easier it would be for a builder to build a large estate over an extended period. I would suggest that residents living in close proximity to such a development would find the disruption of such a long build period totally unacceptable. Another reason for smaller developments over a shorter period.	Noted	No further action required
(vi)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Concerned there is little or no demand for office space/commercial property. There are large amounts of vacant space in the market place.	Noted. This would be a consideration for any future proposals and/or future statutory policy formulation.	No further action required
(vii)		Retail pages 21-23 (2.44, 2.54) very relevant	Noted	No further action required
(viii)		Do not understand p49 bullet 4 - opportunity to move development...	Assume this comment refers to the second bullet on page 49 (fourth bullet under the sub heading 'Employment sites design guidelines'. Agree that the meaning of this is unclear, and should be reworked for clarity.	Revisit 2nd bullet on the page and clarify meaning

(ix)		A recent newspaper article highlights that shops in Kettering are closing as shoppers go to new shopping centre in Corby. Retail is experiencing problems in many areas.	Noted.	No further action required
(x)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Walking distance circles from the Square and the schools should be included on the map on page 51.	Agreed. Circles to indicate walking distances could usefully be incorporated onto the map.	Indicate walking zones on map
(xi)		It is dangerous for cycle tracks on pavements to cross dwelling driveways.	Noted. This is however a matter of detail, which is beyond the scope of the masterplan. This would need to be considered in consultation with the Local Highway Authority as new schemes are developed.	No further action required

(xii)

General comments

The word 'equally' in reference to distribution of housing development is omitted - reference page 5 bullet 4, 4.7 HOG and 5.15

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(xiii)	Nowhere in the Masterplan is mentioned the huge number of residents who have already made their feelings clear regarding large developments.	Noted. The masterplan does however reflect the broad aspiration of the community for smaller scale development.	No further action required
(xiv)	The Northdale End planning application is currently subject to appeal. Whilst having a number of attractive features, it conflicts with the Masterplan principle of developing 'town first'. In addition it is contrary to the wishes of residents and stakeholders.	Noted	No further action required
(xv)	The current Taylor Wimpey application at Darsdale Farm is to up to 460 units, though there is clear intent to increase the number of dwellings above this level. Approximately 1000 letters of objection are held by ENC to this application.	Noted. This application is under consideration, and yet to be determined.	No further action required
(xvi)	Bovis Homes proposed development south of Meadow Lane has already been refused on appeal, on grounds of excessive noise.	Noted	No further action required
(xvii)	Manor Farm east of the school has potential for at least 50 homes. It also provides community facilities at the school and an extension to the school grounds.	Noted	No further action required
(xviii)	Page 5 bullet 4 states that viability work indicates that developments of 200 homes may be required - why? Recent proposals and developments in Raunds have been fewer than 200 homes, and it is assumed that these were viable.	Agree that this conclusion should be clarified within the document.	Clarify the conclusion within the document

(xix)	6.6 - suggests 2 sites should be brought forward. Which 2?	The principles within the Masterplan reflect community preference for dispersed development around the town. The Masterplan however is not a statutory planning document which can allocate specific sites for development, and as such, cannot identify preferred development sites. Instead, it will be used as a piece of evidence in the development of the Four Towns Plan, which will allocate individual sites for development.	No further action required
(xx)	6.7 developer contributions - the new roof tax paid per house used by a number of councils including Milton Keynes, allows the contribution to be paid before development starts for any size development.	Noted. The North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit is currently reviewing means by which developer contributions can be achieved, including Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – which has set scales of contribution per house.. The government has indicated that it intends CIL to replace S106 contributions by 2014 for all contributions except those relating to Affordable Housing.	No further action required
(xxi)	6.8 - Bovis Homes, Northdale End and Warth Park are all offering B1 sites with accessibility and proximity to the existing road network.	Noted	No further action required

(xxii)	Transport - any significant development to the south of the town must adversely affect a greater number of residents due to the geography of the town.	Noted. Traffic impact is one of the areas which will need to be further tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required
(xxiii)	Only a small number of people use the x46 bus. New residents, like existing would use their cars to commute and shop.	Noted, though it is an aspiration to reduce outcommuting	No further action required
(xxiv)	The Darsdale stream is not marked on the map on page 56 although it is referenced in 2.27, which highlights some flood risk.	Agree. This should be indicated on the map	Indicate Darsdale stream on page 56
(xxv)	Page 60 bullet 5 - concerns. How can there be a link between development which exceeds the medium scale and the Raunds Masterplan.	Agree that this is confusing. 'Medium scale' needs to be more carefully defined, to reflect how this relates to the principles of the Masterplan	Amend bullet 5 to clarify meaning
(xxvi)	Part of the Masterplan was to gather the views and ideas of the community. Many may not have taken the considerable time necessary to study the document and reply, in part due to the complexity of the information, and the practical difficulties of replying online.	Noted. The document aims to deal as concisely as possible with the complex themes discussed. In addition, hard copy documents of the draft Masterplan and feedback forms were made available at Raunds library, the Town Council offices, as well as ENC offices, meaning that there was an alternative to commenting online.	No further action required
(xxvii)	However, residents are united in their view to minimise the amount of development and to distribute that which is necessary equally on four sides of the town so that no one area is burdened by large development.	Noted	No further action required

(xxviii)			Has the whole process been a sham regarding new housing in Raunds? Has the community been asked for its opinion for it to be totally ignored? Many feel it is a 'waste of time' making their views known. Is this the case?	The purpose of the Masterplan is to try to build some consensus about the vision for what the people want for Raunds for the future. The Masterplan will form a piece of community-led evidence to be taken into account in preparing the Four Towns Plan (the statutory local planning document which will include Raunds) and also in informing the review of the Core Strategy (a current, key statutory planning document).	No further action required.
19 (i)	Carolyn Wibberley	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	If 500 houses is the target for Raunds, the brownfield sites could provide a quarter of these on sites A-G, and should be developed first.	Noted. The constraints of individual sites have not been assessed as part of the Masterplan process and any more specific site designations would need to be considered through the statutory planning system e.g Four Towns Plan, rather than through the Masterplan.	No further action required.
(ii)			5.5 - safeguarding a route to Darsdale Farm. This should be pedestrian not vehicular.	Agree. This could be specified.	Insert the word 'pedestrian' into the third bullet
(iii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Cannot tick a box as none are applicable.	Noted	No further action required.

(iv)	<p>The majority of residents place the need to retain Raunds' character as fundamental to any change, and see larger scale development as directly opposed to this. This is enshrined in the Masterplan through the direction to disperse development, and reduce the current policy target for the number of houses.</p>	Noted	No further action required.
(v)	<p>Why with brownfield sites bringing forward 100-150 houses are you suggesting bringing forward 2 sites of 200-300 buildings?</p>	<p>The masterplan recommends dispersal of development as discussed at the workshops. However, subsequent testing has led to a conclusion that due to viability, developments of less than 200 homes on the identified sites are unlikely to be viable. As such, it recommends that two of the four identified sites should come forward within the plan period (with potential for the other two to be developed over a longer period of time).</p>	No further action required
(vi)	<p>Why in the 'action plan' (p60) do you state that developments larger than the medium scale should be subject to supplementary design policy? What do you mean by this? How can there be a link?</p>	<p>Agree that this is confusing. 'Medium scale' needs to be more carefully defined, to reflect how this relates to the principles of the Masterplan</p>	Amend bullet 5 to clarify meaning
(vii)	<p>5.15 is what the residents agreed, except the word 'equal' has been omitted.</p>	<p>4.7 HOG already states this, subject to site capacity etc. Page 5, bullet 4 states "evenly" already, which would imply the same meaning. Agree para. 5.15 should insert this to repeat this aim.</p>	Add the word 'equal' to para 5.15

(viii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	There are already several empty properties around the Square and in Brook street which could be developed into small office or workshop premises.	Noted. The principles within the masterplan would certainly support this, though it would be dependant on individual property owners.	No further action required
(ix)		There does not appear to be much demand for these facilities, and the fact that the only bank is now only open twice weekly for 4 hours, will further deter business.	Page 19 onward sets out the current position and evidence base with regard to employment. Text could be added to refer to demand generally.	Add text to refer to general demand
(x)		Warth Park - an ideal location and would bring much needed employment to the town.	Noted	No further action required
(xi)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Map on p51 - no new vehicular lines are shown on land north of Brick Kiln Road, but a new vehicular link is shown leading from Weighbridge Way to Darsdale Farm - why?	Agree - potential accesses to each of the four identified areas are indicated, with the exception of the northern area. This should be rectified for consistency.	Demonstrate a potential access point to the northern area
(xii)		Cycle paths will be dangerous if they cross dwelling accesses on pathways.	Noted. This is however a matter of detail, which is beyond the scope of the masterplan. This would need to be considered in consultation with the Local Highway Authority as new schemes are developed.	No further action required
(xiii)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Walking distances to schools are important - all schools are not marked on the map. No walking circles are shown.	Agree - all schools should be marked on the map, and walking distance circles would be useful	1) Ensure all schools within Raunds are marked on the map. 2) Add indicative walking circles to appropriate map(s)

(xiv)

Map shows a new vehicular link between Weigbridge Way and Darsdale Farm. It was however agreed that it should run from Weigbridge Way to RPC.

The link shown on page 51 is intended to demonstrate how the potential development area identified could be accessed. The topography of the land where this area meets the RPC site is such that any vehicular connection is unlikely to be a realistic proposition.

No further action required

(xv)

Darsdale stream is not marked on the map.

Noted. Darsdale stream should be indicated on the map

Indicate Darsdale stream on the map

(xvi)

6.5 - suggests that developments of 200-300 homes has potential to be viable and would meet the goals of the Masterplan. It would not meet the goals of residents and stakeholders - development should be dispersed equally.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(xvii)			Areas shown on page 56 are not the areas of application by Barwood and Taylor Wimpey.	The masterplan is based on broad community consensus demonstrating a preference for less and more dispersed development. It is clear that this cannot correspond to current planning proposals.	No further action required
(xviii)		General comments	Nowhere does it say that following consultation only 44 people were in favor of the Taylor Wimpey proposal. Darsdale Farm is not scheduled for development in the Raunds Action Plan.	Noted. The masterplan cannot however assess or make judgements on current planning proposals.	No further action required
20 (i)	David and Bernadette Birkett	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	The feeling at the workshops was that the original number of 800 houses was not feasible and would be detrimental to the character of Raunds. The 500 homes was considered as a working number, not a target.	Noted. The approximate figure of 500 homes was based on historic housing completions, and there was a broad consensus that this was a realistic proposition. This is reflected in the Masterplan. The 500 homes does not and cannot form a statutory target. Current housing targets are set out in the adopted Core Spatial Strategy and the findings of the Masterplan will feed into discussions about the review of the Core Strategy.	No further action required

(ii)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Greenfield sites should only be used as a last resort. They should be smaller sites (less than 130) and equally dispersed throughout the town.	The indicative figure of 500 homes as reached with stakeholders and residents, is likely to require some greenfield development. This process has demonstrated that this could not be accommodated on brownfield sites alone. The aspiration of the community for this to be dispersed is clearly set out within the Masterplan document.	No further action required
(iii)		Any houses should be of low density, and trees, hedges and green spaces should be maintained.	Aspirations regarding density are set out within the masterplan to reflect the existing character of Raunds. Retention of trees, hedgerows and green spaces are also matters that would form part of the assessment of any planning proposal.	No further action required
(iv)		On page 43 the greenfield sites are incorrectly numbered in respect of the text on pages 46/47. The map should be amended by changing site 2 to 3 and site 3 to 2.	Agree - the labeling of sites 2 and 3 on the diagram on page 43 should be amended	Amend labels on diagram on page 43 to accurately label sites 2 and 3.
(v)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	All developments should be within a 500m walking distance of the town centre (Market Square) and schools.	Whilst it is agreed that walking circles could usefully be plotted, they are only indicative and do not take account of matters like topography, which affect walking speeds and distances. It would be inappropriate to use such a tool to restrict development, albeit that access to local facilities is a material planning consideration.	Indicate walking circles on appropriate maps.

(vi)	Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	Raunds and its surrounding countryside has good areas of green space. These need to be protected to enhance the character of Raunds.	Noted	No further action required
(vii)	Pages 54-55 - Regenerating the High Street	New houses should be within the 500m walking distance of the town centre and schools.	Whilst it is agreed that walking circles could usefully be plotted, they are only indicative and do not take account of matters like topography, which affect walking speeds and distances. It would be inappropriate to use such a tool to restrict development, albeit that access to local facilities is a material planning consideration.	Indicate walking circles on appropriate maps.
(viii)		Car parking should be carefully examined and additional spaces provided.	The masterplan identifies the need to consider car parking within the town as part of the Action Plan.	No further action required
(ix)		Any measure should be taken with care, to provide additional retail and leisure facilities.	Noted	No further action required
(x)	General comments	Page 17 para 2.21 the library is described as occupying a central location, but on page 22 para 2.50 it is described as somewhat disconnected from the predominant town centre activities. It cannot be both, and the former is correct.	Disagree - a facility may be located centrally, but may also appear disconnected to/from its surroundings	No further action required
(xi)		Page 26 paras 2.67 and para 2.68 - is it a coincidence that both sites are 17.28hectares?	Agree that this needs clarifying	Check respective site areas, and correct as appropriate

(xii)	Page 24 para 2.61 the assertion that it is possible to walk through the town is open to question. It may be possible, but the walk back up hill to Darsdale Home for instance, would be difficult in that time frame.	Noted, however this assumption is qualified and indicative.	No further action required
(xiii)	Page 26 para 2.67 - disagree with Taylor Wimpey's description of its current planning proposal.	Noted	No further action required
(xiv)	Taylor Wimpey consider the Co-op to be the town centre. The Raunds Masterplan states that the Market Square is the town centre.	Noted	No further action required
(xv)	Page 44 para 5.5, the density of Sheffield Court is mentioned, but the report does not say what this density is.	Agree - it would be useful to highlight the density.	Clarify statement by identifying the density of Sheffield Court
(xvi)	Page 47 para 5.10 - the development of the RPC site should safeguard a PEDESTRIAN route to Darsdale Farm.	Agree - this could be specified	Insert the word 'pedestrian' into the third bullet

(xvii)

Page 48 para 5.17 - the report implies that 125 homes in each of the 4 areas may not be possible due to the 'small' size of the developments. However recent developments of approximately 100 have proven viable.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(xviii)

None of the maps show the 500m walking distance from the town square or the schools.

Agreed. Circles to indicate walking distances could usefully be incorporated onto the map.

Indicate walking zones on appropriate map(s)

(xix)	None of the maps show Darsdale stream which joins Hog Dyke, and will therefore have an influence on flooding issues.	Noted. Darsdale stream should be indicated on the map	Indicate Darsdale stream on the map
(xx)	The workshops clearly agreed that the proposed RPC development would be part of the southern 'quota'.	There is a current planning application on the RPC site for residential development. At the current time the RPC site is not allocated for development, and if the application is approved it would constitute a windfall development site. It is therefore unlikely that it would contribute to achieving the housing target. In addition, it should be noted that in considering the amount of development in any one area of the town, significant emphasis must be placed on responding to the opportunities and constraints of the area. Further work will be carried out on this through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required
(xxi)	The document uses the word 'viable' on a number of occasions. A no time does it define 'viable' or say viable to whom (the developer, the Council, the population of Raunds etc)	Agree that the meaning of viability and its implications should be clarified	Clarify what is meant by viability and its implications for the masterplan

21 (i)	Brian Hildreth	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Dwellings should be built on these sites first where possible. Sites A-G, in addition to some modest infill should provide approximately 100 to 150 dwellings at least, which is a significant amount of the 500 homes target.	Noted. The constraints of individual sites have not been assessed as part of the Masterplan process and any more specific site designations would need to be considered through the statutory planning system e.g Four Towns Plan, rather than through the Masterplan.	No further action required
(ii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	It was agreed that there would be no major development on greenfield sites and development should be equally spread north, south, east and west, within walking distance of the square and schools, to minimise traffic impact.	The indicative figure of 500 homes as reached with stakeholders and residents, is likely to require some major development. This process has demonstrated that this could not be accommodated on brownfield sites alone. The aspiration of the community for this to be dispersed is clearly set out within the Masterplan document.	No further action required

(iii)

If greenfield development is necessary and residential development on the RPC site should be included in the southern quota.

There is a current planning application on the RPC site for residential development. At the current time the RPC site is not allocated for development, and if the application is approved it would constitute a windfall development site. It is therefore unlikely that it would contribute to achieving the housing target. In addition, it should be noted that in considering the amount of development in any one area of the town, significant emphasis must be placed on responding to the opportunities and constraints of the area. Further work will be carried out on this through the development of the Four Towns Plan.

No further action required

(iv)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	The Marketing agent working on behalf of RPC concludes that this site is only suitable for residential development. We do not understand page 49, bullet 4.	The existing national and local planning policy framework, place the regeneration of town centres, including Raunds as a high priority. Given the location of this site at the interface with the town centre, there would be an expectation that mixed use development should be considered first to support regeneration of the town centre. There is a current planning application for residential development on the RPC site which is yet to be determined.	No further action required
(v)		Interesting to note the recent closure of shops in Kettering following development in Corby.	Noted	No further action required
(vi)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Walking distance circles from the Town Square and schools should be shown.	Agreed. Circles to indicate walking distances could usefully be incorporated onto the map.	Indicate walking zones on map
(vii)		The new vehicular link shown on map 51 between Weighbridge Way and Darsdale Farm is incorrect. It was agreed that a vehicle link should be provided between the RPC site and Weighbridge Way.	The link shown on page 51 is intended to demonstrate how the potential development area identified could be accessed. The topography of the land where this area meets the RPC site is such that any vehicular connection is unlikely to be a realistic proposition.	No further action required
(viii)		Page 47 bullet 5 - a 'pedestrian link' be maintained between RPC and Darsdale Farm.	Agree - this could be specified	Insert the word 'pedestrian' into the third bullet

(ix)		Page 52 bullet 8 - cycle tracks should not cross dwelling driveways.	Noted. This is however a matter of detail, which is beyond the scope of the masterplan. This would need to be considered in consultation with the Local Highway Authority as new schemes are developed.	No further action required
(x)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Indicative plan on page 56 bears no comparison with current development proposals. In particular with the southern area development.	The masterplan is based on broad community consensus demonstrating a preference for less development which is more dispersed. It is clear that this cannot correspond to current planning proposals.	No further action required
(xi)	General comments	Page 43 - sites 2 and 3 labeled incorrectly	Agree - the labeling of sites 2 and 3 on the diagram on page 43 should be amended	Amend labels on diagram on page 43 to accurately label sites 2 and 3.
(xii)		Para 5.15 - insert the word 'equally'. Also to page 5 bullet 4 and 4.7HOG.	4.7 HOG already states this, subject to site capacity etc. Page 5, bullet 4 states "evenly" already, which would imply the same meaning. Agree para. 5.15 should insert this to repeat this aim.	Add the word 'equal' to para 5.15
(xiii)		Page 60 bullet 5 - what does this mean?	Agree that this is confusing. 'Medium scale' needs to be more carefully defined, to reflect how this relates to the principles of the Masterplan	Amend bullet 5 to clarify meaning

(xiv)	Localisation was brought forward by the present Government. Are we to ignore the wishes of the residents in favor of a large developer trying to maximise profits at our expense?	The purpose of the Masterplan is to try to build some consensus about the vision for what the people want for Raunds for the future. The Masterplan will form a piece of community-led evidence to be taken into account in preparing the Four Towns Plan (the statutory local planning document which will include Raunds) and also in informing the review of the Core Strategy (a current, key statutory planning document).	No further action required
(xv)	Please note that this form has been manufactured because the comment boxes in the original downloaded document would only accept writing in the comments sections with Acrobat Writer. Like thousands of others I only have Acrobat Reader. It is unfortunate that the feedback forms in this process could not be used by many of the residents.	Noted. However alternative formats of the feedback form were available on East Northamptonshire Council's website, including an interactive questionnaire for online submission, and a 'Word' version for download. Hard copies were also made available at Raunds library and Raunds Town Council.	No further action required
(xvi)	A key aim of the masterplan as set out in 4.18 is to reduce out commuting from the town - this is not highlighted within the Key Recommendations.	Agree - this should be more explicit within the key recommendations	Reflect this in the wording of the recommendations
(xvii)	Any development would impact on transport infrastructure but none more so than in the south. This problem was highlighted in the RAP, and the Chelveston Road/Stanwick junction is cited as a particular problem.	Noted. Traffic impact is one of the areas which will need to be further tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required

(xviii)	The current Taylor Wimpey proposal is outside the 5 minute walking area, and the bulk is outside the 15 minute walking zone.	Noted	No further action required
(xix)	If major development is forced onto the town, it would not be sensible for this to happen in the south. The only sensible option would be to develop north of the town close to the A45, which is contrary to the 'town first' proposal.	Noted. Further testing will be required in developing the Four Towns Plan	No further action required
(xx)	The link between the RPC site and Darsdale Farm was a pedestrian link to the footpath through Darsdale Farm. Page 52 bullet 8 - this should be clearly identified in 5.10 bullet 8.	Agree - this could be specified	Insert the word 'pedestrian' into the third bullet
(xxi)	Infill development should provide at least 150 (including the RPC site) during the likely Core Spatial Strategy period, which would leave 350 homes to be developed on greenfield sites. It was agreed that these should be equally divided north, south, east and west with no major development in any area.	Noted. The constraints of individual sites have not been assessed as part of the Masterplan process. This is something that will need to be considered in the development of future statutory planning policy.	No further action required

(xxii)

In view of recent development (since 2000), development in the south amounting to well over 200 dwellings, it was agreed that the southern quota should include the residential development on the RPC site.

There is a current planning application on the RPC site for residential development. At the current time the RPC site is not allocated for development, and if the application is approved it would constitute a windfall development site. It is therefore unlikely that it would contribute to achieving the housing target. In addition, it should be noted that in considering the amount of development in any one area of the town, significant emphasis must be placed on responding to the opportunities and constraints of the area. Further work will be carried out on this through the development of the Four Towns Plan.

No further action required

(xxiii)

6.5 - If four sites were developed as agreed by residents and stakeholders, each site would be less than 200 homes. Why would these sites not be viable? Other sites of this scale have been developed in the past, and the Bovis and Manor Farm proposals are less than 200 houses and considered viable.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This figure is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(xxiv)	6.6 - Bringing forward 2 of the 4 areas identified within the Core Strategy period is contrary to the wishes of residents and stakeholders. The reasoning for this is confusing.	Agree that clarification is required on this conclusion	Clarify the conclusion within the document
(xxv)	6.7 - Contributions for developing and improving the town centre should not depend entirely on developer contributions. Other options such as exploring the potential for a roof tax (like Milton Keynes) should be explored to secure money prior to development.	Noted. The North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit is currently reviewing means by which developer contributions achieved, including Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – which has set scales of contribution per house.. The government has indicated that it intends CIL to replace S106 contributions by 2014 for all contributions except those relating to Affordable Housing. Other potential sources of funding are unclear at present.	No further action required
(xxvi)	6.7 - The imposition of the 40% affordable homes policy is likely to decrease the amount of money available to meet these costs. It is unlikely that families on lower incomes will use the town's retail offer rather than cheaper superstores close by. A 40% affordable requirement for a population the size of Raunds is likely to ensure eventual decline.	The target for up to 40% of larger residential developments to be affordable housing is set out in Policy 15 of the adopted Core Spatial Strategy. The wording of this Policy does not specifically set out that viability should be taken into account, however national guidance does.	No further action required

(xxvii)			6.8 - Although not welcome by some residents, fast food outlets, take away restaurants and coffee shops have been the fastest developing sector and now occupy the largest commercial sector in the town. They do provide what is clearly in demand, together with some employment.	Noted	No further action required
(xxviii)			Concerned that as a material consideration, the Masterplan should be accurate. Developer descriptions of their proposals are considered inaccurate, particularly the Darsdale Farm proposal.	Noted. The descriptions however are noted as how the developers describe their schemes. The Masterplan states that it makes no assessment of individual proposals.	Underline statements which identify that descriptions are developer descriptions, to emphasise this point further (2.66, 2.67, 2.68, 2.69, 2.70)
22 (i)	David Gent	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	I believe brownfield sites should be viewed as a priority for development.	Noted. This is a stated aspiration of the community.	No further action required
(ii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	I prefer to see the brownfield sites developed thus reducing/eliminating the need for any greenfield development.	Noted. This is a stated aspiration of the community, albeit that the practicalities and constraints of developing the identified sites have not yet been considered in detail.	No further action required
(iii)		Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	My major concern with regards the Midland Road site, is that the road is not capable of safely supporting the traffic.	Noted. Traffic impact is one of the areas which will need to be further tested through the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required

(iv)	General comments	Please do your best to use as many of the brownfield sites as possible before wrecking 'any' greenfield land.	Noted. This is a stated aspiration of the community, although the masterplan does identify that only a small amount of development can realistically be accommodated on brownfield sites.	No further action required	
23 (i)	Mr B. T Smart	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Particularly brownfield sites should be developed before and greenfield development.	Noted. This is a stated aspiration of the community, albeit that the practicalities and constraints of developing the identified sites have not yet been considered in detail.	No further action required

(ii)

Pages 46-48 -
Greenfield
development sites

(agree) provided developments are
distributed evenly over the four sites.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion
on viability of
greenfield sites.

		(iii)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Employment for the people in Raunds.	The Masterplan makes recommendations to enhance the existing employment offer in Raunds. This would enhance job opportunities locally for residents, although posts could not be restricted as being only for Raunds residents.	No further action required
		(iv)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Better use of Saxon Hall car park.	Noted. This is beyond the scope of the Masterplan. However this feedback will be shared with Raunds Town Council.	No further action required regarding the Masterplan
		(v)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Whatever the number of homes to be provided, it is important that they are distributed evenly over selected (preferably brownfield) sites.	Noted. The principle of distributing development is set out within the Masterplan.	No further action required
		(vi)	General comments	If there is to be development in Raunds, careful consideration should be given to the character of town. To be avoided is a single housing development. I do not want to see Raunds become another Rushden or Wellingborough. I believe it should remain a pleasant country town.	Protecting the character of Raunds is one of the key objectives of the Masterplan (page 29, HO1), and the principle of dispersing development is established within the document.	No further action required
24	(i) G and C Murray		Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	Where possible, buildings should always be on brownfield sites first. Sites A-G provide approximately 100-150 dwellings - a quarter of the 500 if that is the true amount.	Noted. The constraints of individual sites have not been assessed as part of the Masterplan process and any more specific site designations would need to be considered through the statutory planning system e.g Four Towns Plan, rather than through the Masterplan.	No further action required

(ii)

Pages 46-48 -
Greenfield
development sites

The residents do not desire large scale developments in one part of the town. It should be spread equally around the town and also retain Raunds' character and identity.

Noted. This is reflected in the Masterplan.

No further action required

(iii)

With brownfield sites bringing forward 100-150 dwellings are you suggesting bringing forward two sites of 200-300 dwellings?

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(iv)	Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Concerned there is hardly any demand for class A office space, commercial property. There is vacant space on the market.	Section 2 (page 19 onward) outlines the current position and evidence base. The need for further space would need to be assessed as new schemes are developed.	No further action required
(v)		The Town's bank is only open two days per week.	Noted	No further action required
(vi)		According to newspapers, Kettering is losing trade to Corby's new shopping centre. People will not shop in town but rather go to larger centres.	Noted	No further action required
(vii)	Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Walking distance circles from the town centre (the square) and schools should be included on the map on p51.	Agreed. Circles to indicate walking distances could usefully be incorporated onto the map.	Indicate walking zones on map
(viii)		It would be very dangerous for cycle paths outside of people's homes and driveways, as you would not see the cyclist until your car was on the cycle track.	Noted. This is however a matter of detail, which is beyond the scope of the masterplan. This would need to be considered in consultation with the Local Highway Authority as new schemes are developed.	No further action required
(ix)	Page 52 - promoting Community Facilities	Page 52 bullet 9 - as this is written, it does not make any sense. It is very confusing.	Agree that this needs clarifying and amending	Amend bullet to identify that new developments might either provide new space or make financial contributions to improving existing spaces based on the site context.

(x)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	New vehicular access runs from Weighbridge Way south to Darsdale Farm. It was agreed that it should run from Weighbridge Way to the RPC site.	The link shown on page 51 is intended to demonstrate how the potential development area identified could be accessed. The topography of the land where this area meets the RPC site is such that any vehicular connection is unlikely to be a realistic proposition.	No further action required
(xi)	General comments	Downstream flood risk associated with Darsdale stream which bisects the town. This is not marked on the map on page 56.	Agree that stream should be identified on the map for consistency	Identify Darsdale stream on map
(xii)		Sites on map on page 43 are labeled incorrectly.	Agree - the labeling of sites 2 and 3 on the diagram on page 43 should be amended	Amend labels on diagram on page 43 to accurately label sites 2 and 3.

(xiii)

Medium scale development of 200-300 homes does not meet the goals of residents and stakeholders. Development should be dispersed equally.

Since the workshops, further work has tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would probably not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes at any time, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact on viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a longer period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

Clarify the conclusion on viability of greenfield sites.

(xiv)

Bovis Homes and Manor Farm proposals are smaller than 200 homes and considered viable.

The Masterplan does not assess individual planning proposals.

No further action required

25 (i)	Mrs Pauline Williams	Pages 44-45 - Brownfield development sites	It should be stipulated that the brownfield sites should be used for infill before using greenfield sites.	Whilst there is a clear and acknowledged community aspiration for brownfield sites to develop first, it will not be possible to stipulate this. As the Masterplan acknowledges, brownfield sites alone will not deliver the housing growth. In addition, there has not been a robust investigation into the practicalities and constraints of developing the identified sites. It is therefore not clear whether these sites are viable to be developed first.	No further action required
(ii)		Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	(agree) provided developments are distributed evenly over the four sites.	Noted. The principle of distributing development is set out within the Masterplan.	No further action required
(iii)		Pages 48-49 - Employment sites	Proposed business development as reported in the local paper should be taken into consideration.	Noted.	No further action required
(iv)			Employment needs to be for Raunds residents.	The Masterplan makes recommendations to enhance the existing employment offer in Raunds. This would enhance job opportunities locally for residents, although posts could not be restricted as being only for Raunds residents.	No further action required
(v)		Pages 50 - 51 - Connecting the town	Better use to be made of the Saxon Hall car park.	Noted. This is beyond the scope of the Masterplan, however this feedback will be shared with Raunds Town Council.	No further action required with regard to the Masterplan

(vi)

Pages 56 - 57 Key
Recommendations

Whatever number of homes are to be built, it should be ensured that these are evenly spread over four sites.

Since those workshops, AECOM has undertaken further work and tested the emerging ideas. The result of this testing is a conclusion that it would not be viable to develop sites for less than 200 homes, albeit that the reasoning for this should be clarified. It is important to recognise the impact of viability. Development of all four sites (identified during the workshops), for 200 homes through the plan period would exceed the community aspiration for less development, the framework for which was established at 500 houses, based on historic completion rates. This figure is not therefore currently a recommendation of the Masterplan. The Masterplan still clearly identifies a principle of dispersing development on each side of the town. It is however likely that this would occur over a period of time. The Masterplan's role is not to allocate specific sites. Further work will need to be carried out, in order to prepare specific land use policies within the forthcoming Four Towns Plan.

(vii)	General comments	It is appreciated that there needs to be development in Raunds, but great consideration should be given to the character of the town and any single massive development should be avoided.	These aspirations are established principles within the Masterplan	No further action required
(viii)		I would not like Raunds to become a Rushden or a Wellingborough.	Agree. The aim of the Masterplan is to protect and enhance the intrinsic character of Raunds.	No further action required
26 (i)	Environment Agency (not in questionnaire format)	General comments Support the strategic approach to tackling development pressures. Also support the Masterplan being based on a long term vision, and a framework for development that would be delivered over time.	Noted	No further action required
(ii)		Consider that there is a need for stronger links between a vision for Raunds seeking to enhance the character of the settlement whilst encouraging a sustainable approach to development. Consider the two to be closely related.	Noted	No further action required
(iii)		Page 17 Flooding and drainage - this section focuses on and reiterates many of the principles detailed in the 2006 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which is currently being updated and contains little information on non-fluvial flooding. We know that there are serious integrated urban drainage issues in Raunds and this process represents probably the best opportunity in the next ten years to address these.	Noted	No further action required

(iv)	<p>It is advised that reliance on PPS 25 itself would be inadequate to resolve these problems without constraining the regeneration of Raunds. For example, ad-hoc provision of drainage and flood storage on site might render some sites unviable or severely constrain the extent of development. It is therefore recommended that a strategic approach is adopted seeking betterment on green field sites in the form of SUDS, Making Space for Water, and where possible, seeking contributions to improve public space for water off site. This would probably require further investigation and forward planning.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be explored and tested during the development of the Four Towns Plan.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(v)	<p>The Masterplan should incorporate the latest information on flood risk from fluvial and non-fluvial sources in the catchment area.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be incorporated into the development of the Four Towns Plan.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
(vi)	<p>We strongly recommend that as a first step, the findings of the Level 1 SFRA are awaited prior to finalising the report.</p>	<p>Noted. However, as this document is intended as a piece of community led evidence which will contribute to the Four Towns Plan, and not as a statutory planning document, this is not considered necessary. Instead the SFRA will inform the development of the Four Towns Plan.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

(vii)	Para 2.26 - It is assumed that this refers to Northdale End, which is a development proposal we have been consulted on, which includes a flood alleviation scheme. We have provided site specific comments to the Local Planning Authority on this scheme.	Noted	No further action required
(viii)	Para 2.27 - It is assumed that this paragraph relates to Darsdale Farm. Site specific comments have been provided in relation to this application.	Noted	No further action required
(ix)	Para 2.28 - All development on undeveloped land must achieve Greenfield run-off rates and volumes or better. This will help ensure that current problems are not worsened.	Agree that wording of this paragraph should be amended to better reflect this.	Amend/add to text in para 2.28.
(x)	Para 2.29 - request that the third sentence be amended to read 'The EA has withdrawn its objections in respect of flood risk, subject to the imposition of conditions requiring betterment...'. We requested relevant conditions as sufficient information had been provided on the applications we have been consulted on to demonstrate that surface water can be managed appropriately and not increase flood risk.	Agree to proposed amendment	Amend para 2.29 in line with recommendation

(xi)	Para 2.30 - If available during the preparation of the Raunds Masterplan, the up-dated SFRA should be used as an evidence base.	Noted. However, as this document is intended as a piece of community led evidence which will contribute to the Four Towns Plan, and not as a statutory planning document, this is not considered necessary. Instead the SFRA will inform the development of the Four Towns Plan.	No further action required
(xii)	Para 2.68 Meadow Lane. Please refer to our comments to ENC with regard to this application.	Noted	No further action required
(xiii)	Objective 3.5:ES3 (p29) - encourages flood protection rather than flood prevention. The flood risk management hierarchy steps: 1 - Assess, 2- Avoid, 3 - Substitute, 4 - Control and 5 - Mitigate. Mitigation should only be considered after the sequential approach has been applied to development proposals. By following the hierarchical approach above, development should always be located in areas of lowest flood risk first. Only when it has been established that there are no suitable alternative options in lower risk areas should design solutions/mitigation be considered to exceptionally allow development to proceed. Objective should be reworded to encourage development that reduces flood risk.	The objectives set out were developed with local stakeholders and residents. It is however considered that the overall aim of this objective was to reduce risk to local property, and therefore amendment to reflect a desire for reduction in flood risk rather than flood mitigation alone, is not thought detrimental to the local aspirations behind this objective.	Amend objective to reflect EA advice

(xiv)	Page 35 para 4.11 - commend recognition that flooding is a key issue in Raunds, and we support the principle of promoting space for water and opening up existing culverted watercourses.	Noted	No further action required
(xv)	Page 35 para 4.11 - third sentence: recommend that 'mitigate' is changed to 'reduce'.	Agree	Amend sentence as suggested
(xvi)	Page 35 para 4.11 forth sentence: recommend that 'swales and retention pond' is changed to SuDS, as there are other methods besides these that can be used. In addition, this statement should go further to state that developments 'must include' rather than should include.	Agree	Amend sentence as suggested
(xvii)	The final part of the sentence referred to above (p35 para 4.11, 4th) should again encourage flood reduction. Recommend that 'flood mitigation benefits' be amended to 'flood reduction measures'.	Agree	Amend sentence as suggested
(xviii)	Page 35 - ESE: It is not possible to completely eliminate the risk of flooding. Recommend the principle be amended to read: 'Celebrate the stream - open up the watercourse, where possible, to promote a positive realm for the natural environment, which encourages biodiversity and includes measures to reduce flood risk'.	Agree that proposed wording aids clarification, and does not affect the meaning.	Amend phrasing of 'ESE'
(xix)	Page 35 ESF: Recommend that 'mitigate flooding' is changed to 'reduce flood risk'.	Agree	Amend sentence as suggested
(xx)	Page 43 - sites 2 and 3 incorrectly labeled.	Agree - the labeling of sites 2 and 3 on the diagram on page 43 should be amended	Amend labels on diagram on page 43 to accurately label sites 2 and 3.

(xxi)		Page 43 highlights a number of sites. We consider that only 1 is within the floodplain (Site B is shown to be within Flood Zone 2) and the sequential test would be applied.	Noted	No further action required
(xxii)		Page 43 - other sites could be larger than 1 ha in Flood Zone 1 and will require a surface water drainage strategy to be produced and SuDS should be used wherever possible.	Noted	No further action required
(xxiii)		Flood Risk Assessments must be undertaken for developments over an area greater than 1 ha, or where development is within the flood plain.	Noted	No further action required
(xxiv)	Integrating Open spaces	Page 53 - welcome reference to retention ponds. However, to make this more robust, we recommend emphasizing the link between green open space and reducing flood risk (blue space).	Agree that there is scope for further emphasis on this point	Amend bullet 3
(xxv)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	Although the document identifies flooding as a key issue for Raunds, none of the key recommendations refer to flood risk. Perhaps this reflects the need to wait for the SFRA. We suggest that further work is recommended in the interim, suggesting wording as follows: "Proposals involving open space, areas at risk of flooding or sites within 25m of a watercourse should be progressed in connection with a flood risk management strategy. The strategy should be informed by the strategic flood risk assessment process."	Agree that reducing flood risk could be reflected in the key recommendations.	Reflect reducing flood risk within the key recommendations.

(xxvi)	General comments	Flood defense consent informative - highlights need to liaise with EA for any works affecting watercourses, main rivers or within the indicative flood plain.	Noted	No further action required	
(xxvii)		Flood Water Management Act 2010 - other agencies also need consulting regarding flood risk, including NCC.	Noted	No further action required	
(xxviii)		A strategic approach to water infrastructure services is required. This is particularly important in Raunds as it is dependant on Raunds Sewage Treatment Works. Recommend early consultation with Anglian Water to ensure infrastructure capacity associated with the proposals.	Noted. This is however beyond the scope of the Masterplan, which is intended to set out a vision for Raunds. Detailed studies and consultation on infrastructure capacity will form part of the development of a Development Plan Document.	No further action required	
27 (i)	Northamptonshire County Council Fire and Rescue Service (not in questionnaire format)	General comments	Early engagement and consultation with the emergency services around any changes to access and movement arrangements are vital to ensure emergency access and operational standards are maintained.	Noted	No further action required
(ii)			Note comments regarding future affordable housing provision. Recommend incorporating residential sprinkler systems in affordable housing.	Noted - beyond the scope of the Masterplan	No further action required

			Recommend that other matters which contribute to creating sustainable communities, be included in the document, including for example designing out crime and antisocial behavior and fire safety measures.	Noted. Reference to such practices could be included.	Add references	
			Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue adopts a tariff approach to seek financial contributions from developers to mitigate the impact of growth on service provision. We will be looking to engage with ENC as each development proposal comes forward to discuss appropriate developer contributions.	Noted	No further action required	
28	(i)	SSR Planning (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	Land south of RPC Containers is referred to on page 46 as site 2, but on the diagram on page 43 this site is labeled site 3. Clarification is required.	Agree - the labeling of sites 2 and 3 on the diagram on page 43 should be amended	Amend labels on diagram on page 43 to accurately label sites 2 and 3.
	(ii)			We agree that there should be a comprehensive development scheme for the land south of RPC Containers, which would include pedestrian and vehicular links and enhance the town's transport connections. Taylor Wimpey is committed to a comprehensive and attractively designed scheme for development in this location.	Noted	No further action required

(iii)	<p>The undetermined application for Darsdale Farm (07/02238/OUT) includes an illustrative concept masterplan which shows consideration of sustainable design principles. The development will be well served by vehicular and pedestrian links including vehicular access points connecting to the B663 and an integrated footpath network which connects to the town centre, Wellington Road and Chelveston Road. The design also includes quality green infrastructure such as open space, green fingers and lakeside area which will benefit both new and existing residents.</p>	Noted	No further action required	
(iv)	Pages 56 - 57 Key Recommendations	<p>Our client is broadly supportive of the rationale behind the Masterplan which seeks to address the issues within the town. A holistic approach to future development would secure and sustain the regeneration of the town. Through housing growth, services and facilities can be sustained and infrastructure provided. It should be recognised that it is only through housing growth that the town can be enhanced.</p>	Noted	No further action required

(v)

Concerned regarding recommendations in paragraph 6.6. The reduction in the housing target for Raunds is unjustified and unsupported by evidence. The housing requirement for Raunds to 2021 is stated as 1,100 in the Core Spatial Strategy. A target of 500 to 2026 equates to an annual requirement of 33 dwellings per annum. Not only has the amount of housing required been decreased, resulting in a significantly lower annual housing requirement, but the timeframe to deliver it has also increased. The annual housing requirement would be less than half what it is in the Core Spatial Strategy.

The Raunds Masterplan is intended to be a piece of evidence which will be a consideration in the direction of future policy in relation to Raunds. One of the ways it may be used is in discussing revisions to the adopted North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, which is currently under review. It is however acknowledged that the adopted Core Spatial Strategy currently remains the strategic policy framework which guides development in Raunds, and sets out the current housing targets. It should be noted however that the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit have already published proposals to extend the current housing targets over a longer period of time to 2028. This proposal was accepted by ENC's Planning Policy Committee on 22 November 2010. As such, the indicative annual housing requirement for Raunds is likely to be decreased as soon as the appropriate legislative framework allows.

Add a new page at the beginning of the document (before the Executive Summary) to clarify the purpose and current status of the Masterplan.

It is a false premise to identify a target of 500 homes on the basis of historic housing completions. It is not based on any evidence of the need and demand for housing as required by the Government in its response to Questions of July 6th 2010.

The housing figure represents the broad consensus reached during the Enquiry by Design workshop process with residents and stakeholders, and needs to be recorded as such. The conclusions of the Masterplan will help to inform ENC's discussions with the Joint Planning Unit regarding the review of the Core Strategy, and also provide information for the preparation of the Four Towns Plan. The recommendations will be robustly tested through the development of those policy documents. This framework could be more clearly set out at the beginning of the Masterplant, to clarify the status and purpose of the document.

Add a new page at the beginning of the document (before the Executive Summary) to clarify the purpose and current status of the Masterplan.

East Northamptonshire Council has not abandoned the Raunds Area Plan, in favor of developing a Four Towns Plan DPD, though no consultation documents have yet been produced. Consequently, no plans for the greenfield urban extensions which it acknowledged would be required to enable the requisite number of completions in Raunds has been available. This has resulted in developers and other proceeding by means of planning applications, none of which have been supported by the Council. For this reason, the past rate of completions bears no relationship to need and should not be used as a basis for future housing projections.

Noted. During the workshops, a number of growth scenarios were considered, including one based on the current Core Strategy targets, one for approximately 500 homes based on historic completions, and one on much less development. The recommendations of the masterplan are based on the scenario which most participants were most comfortable with, following discussion of all themes. The review of the Core Spatial Strategy and the Four Towns Plan will need to consider and have robust evidence for what housing targets appear in the statutory documents.

No further action required

(vi)

The reduced target fails to reflect or address the current issues in the town, and the need to provide new homes and regenerate the town through improved infrastructure etc.

As above. The recommendation reflects the aspirations of the community, and will require robust testing in the development of new statutory policy.

No further action required

(vii)

The target has no evidence or policy basis and would be found unsound in light of the target stated in the adopted Core Strategy. The only other evidence to adequately assess housing need would be the North Northamptonshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2007.

The Raunds Masterplan is intended to be a piece of evidence which will be a consideration in the direction of future policy in relation to Raunds. One of the ways it may be used is in discussing revisions to the adopted North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, which is currently under review. It is however acknowledged that the adopted Core Spatial Strategy currently remains the strategic policy framework which guides development in Raunds, and sets out the current housing targets. It should be noted however that the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit have already published proposals to extend the current housing targets over a longer period of time to 2028. This proposal was accepted by ENC's Planning Policy Committee on 22 November 2010. As such, the indicative annual housing requirement for Raunds is likely to be decreased as soon as the appropriate legislative framework allows.

Add a new page at the beginning of the document (before the Executive Summary) to clarify the purpose and current status of the Masterplan.

(viii)

We understand that the Core Spatial Strategy is being reviewed, and that the Joint Planning Unit has published a Statement of Intent which stretches the existing adopted housing target over a longer period. However objections to this were raised during the consultation in respect of it being unjustified, untested and unsound.

Noted

No further action required

(ix)

Even though the planning system is in a state of flux, the adopted Core Strategy cannot be ignored in the meantime, and it would be unjustified to presume housing figures in advance of the Core Strategy review, where they can be properly tested and assessed. It is inappropriate to do so in the Raunds Masterplan.

It is accepted that the Raunds Masterplan document cannot override the adopted policy of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, with regard to housing figures. The lower housing figure however is representative of the broad conclusions reached during the Enquiry by Design style process with residents and stakeholders, and needs to be recorded as such. It is intended that the conclusions of the Masterplan will inform ENC's discussions with the Joint Planning Unit regarding the review of the Core Strategy, and also guide the development of the Four Towns Plan as it relates to Raunds. The recommendations will be further tested through the development of these policies. This could be more robustly set out at the beginning of the document, to clarify the status and purpose of the document.

Add a new page at the beginning of the document (before the Executive Summary) to clarify the purpose and current status of the Masterplan.

(x)

Further to this, Raunds should not be considered in isolation, but should be seen in relation to the Core Strategy and wider planning area.

Noted. The purpose of the Masterplan, however is to develop a local consensus and highlight aspirations for Raunds.

No further action required

			<p>(xi) The diagram on page 56 depicts four potential development areas which have been identified to accommodate the 500 homes proposed. It is envisaged in the Masterplan that only 2 of these areas could be brought forward within the Core Strategy period. It is the intention of Taylor Wimpey to bring forward the site at Darsdale Farm, a part of which has been identified within the potential development area to the south of the RPC site.</p>	Noted	No further action required
			<p>(xii) We support this potential development area as we consider this to be a better location for development than other potential development areas due to its proximity to existing services and facilities within the town. However, the area circle does include a Scheduled Ancient Monument, which doesn't appear to have been identified on the plan. Development would have to be sensitive to this.</p>	Noted. The Scheduled Ancient Monument should be identified and plotted on the map	Mark Scheduled Ancient Monument on appropriate maps. This may impact the key recommendations map.
29 (i)	ENC officers	Pages 46-48 - Greenfield development sites	<p>5.8 - believe bullet 3 should be 'Mountbatten Way'</p> <p>Reference to sites 2 and 3 doesn't match map on page 43.</p> <p>5.10 - Reference to Mountbatten Drive - believe this should be Mountbatten Way</p>	<p>Street name to be checked and amended as appropriate</p> <p>Diagram on page 43 is incorrect. Amend labels of sites 2 and 3 so that they area accurate.</p> <p>Street name to be checked and amended as appropriate</p>	<p>Street name to be checked and amended as appropriate</p> <p>Amend labels of sites 2 and 3 so that they area accurate</p> <p>Street name to be checked and amended as appropriate</p>

	Page 54, Town Hall Green, point 1 - 'stairs' should read 'steps'	Agree	Substitute 'stairs' for 'steps'
General comments	The executive summary is not identified on the contents page (p2) or page 3.	All contents should be reflected on the contents page	Add executive summary to the contents page
General comments	It would be useful to populate the Action Plan with timescales where possible to make it more specific and target led.	Agree that broad timescales of 'short/medium/long term' tasks would be helpful. It would be difficult to be more specific on many of the tasks due to different organisations involved.	Identify whether actions are intended in the short/medium/long term.