

**Summary of Comments Received from Signet Planning Ltd and Parish Council Response**

(Para reference is numbering in the representations document submitted by Signet Planning)

Para Ref.	Organisation	Consultation Comment	Swanwick Parish Council Response
<b>SIGNET PLANNING LTD</b>			
3.1		NP is not sound because it does not refer to emerging policy SG12 in emerging Local Plan.	NPs are tested against adopted policies i.e. the 2006 Local Plan and the evidence base for emerging plans, there is no requirement to assess against emerging policies because they do not have a legal status and could change.
3.1		It is not positively prepared	The Plan is positively prepared and the emphasis throughout is that this Plan is not trying to stop development but rather how to protect the setting of the village if development occurs. This is not mutually exclusive to some development at Lily Street and solutions like a Community Park that is proposed.
3.4		The NP looks backward to out of date Development Plan Policies	The plan will be tested against 2006 policies see NPPG Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20140306
3.5		Refers to para 184 NPPF % emphasizes 'Neighbourhood plans & orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.	As above, there is no requirement to assess against emerging policies. The SNP does not attempt to stop the Lilly Street development but it requires high quality design and landscaping and the creation of a Community Park to act as a buffer between any employment development

**Swanwick Parish Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement**

Para Ref.	Organisation	Consultation Comment	Swanwick Parish Council Response
			and housing development on the Lily Street site.
3.6a		It does not reflect and is not consistent with emerging strategic policies	Already covered above (3.5)
3.6b		It does not plan positively for identified housing and employment needs.	<p>There is still controversy about housing needs. The need for further employment land is subject to a review of Employment Land within the Borough.</p> <p>Despite this the NP is positive about housing and employment growth that will meet the needs of both Swanwick residents and the wider community. It does not attempt to stop development per se</p>
3.8		<p>Need for market and affordable housing .....NP make no allocations ...and the lack of housing allocation is not justified</p> <p>It is not sound.</p>	<p>The lack of certainty about the strategic growth requirements in the district due to the delay in the adoption of a new Local Plan was a key factor in why no further allocations have been made.</p> <p>A NP does not have to make site allocations; the NP is a criterion based Plan setting out the design and other standards required where development occurs in the Plan area.</p> <p>A NP is not tested against the soundness principle of a local plan but against the basic conditions. Not having site allocations in a NP is irrelevant to the basic conditions test. Instead the NP focused on policies that would 'shape and direct sustainable</p>

**Swanwick Parish Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement**

Para Ref.	Organisation	Consultation Comment	Swanwick Parish Council Response
			development' NPPF para 184.
3.9		Reference to former Andrew's Builders Yard but no specific reference to housing provision	<p>The ref to Andrews's Builders yard is an example of a site that the community would welcome for community use; the Plan expresses no view on it being particularly for housing use.</p> <p>The Plan does not need to identify land for housing; this is not within the scope of this Plan.</p>
3.9		Allocation of affordable housing on local connection criteria is welcomed & no reason why this could not be secured by way of S106 agreement.	The PC welcomes the support given to the allocation of affordable housing based on local connection criteria at Lily Street Farm. The PC would look to secure this arrangement if planning permission for housing was obtained.
3.10		Policy reference to expanding existing businesses in the Plan area, but no reference to the need for new investment in the village to deliver jobs.	<p>The scope of the Plan does not need to include allocating land for employment use. The Plan focuses on the need to support local businesses and the provision of better broadband connections.</p> <p>The possible re-use of Andrew's Builders Yard for a mixed use scheme (primarily community and retail use) and the need to identify additional off-street car parking are intended to support the economic vitality of the retail core.</p>
3.11 –		Education .... SNP makes passing	The scope of NPs is up to the

**Swanwick Parish Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement**

Para Ref.	Organisation	Consultation Comment	Swanwick Parish Council Response
3.16		reference to school capacity at Swanwick Primary School..... The lack of any policy provision with the SNP is a serious omission which needs to be addressed	community; the NP is not intended as a mini local plan and the educational constraints of the local school are not matters the NP needs to address. A lack of comment on it in the Plan is not an oversight it reflects the scope of the SNP which is about setting out the design principles for development, being clear on what housing mix and type is needed etc.
3.17 – 3.19		Community Building ...master plan makes provision of 0.1ha ‘Community Plot/ medical Plot’ ..... land at Lily Street would have no cost and its delivery would be secured by way of S106 agreement.	The community have identified a site at the heart of their community which is well located for local residents. Whether the Lily street proposals may or may not provide the opportunity to provide a community/ medical building does not diminish the value of this policy.  Securing the land for the proposed use is possible or it would not have been included in the Plan
3.20 – 3.21		Medical Facilities....	The scope of NP is up to the community; the provision of a medical centre rests with the NHS and is not within scope of the NP.  Fig 2 in Signet’s response omits a dental practice in Derby Rd in the centre of Swanwick.
3.22 – 3.23 & 3.28		Community Park .....supports this overall objective.....requires land that will only be forthcoming in association with development of a broader area  Community Objective 2 supported..... there should be acknowledgement that such will only be achieved through	The PC welcomes ideas for the delivery of a community park and is aware of the fact that it can only be successfully secured with the cooperation of a number of

**Swanwick Parish Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement**

<b>Para Ref.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Consultation Comment</b>	<b>Swanwick Parish Council Response</b>
		development	land owners.
<b>3.31</b>		Community Objective 5 ...unrealistic as it is effectively a moratorium on future development in and round the village.....there will inevitable be some impact on views	Objective 5 is not a moratorium on all development. Wanting to protect the village setting is not a 'moratorium on new development' rather the NP provides suggestions as to how development could be possible (through design and landscaping) whilst protecting the setting of the village.
<b>3.34</b>		Community Objective 8...reference to the village centre should be deleted..... It is too prescriptive	Is intended to encourage investment in the village centre; reflecting the needs and opinions of existing residents
<b>3.38 – 3.39</b>		Planning Policy 1 ...there is no 'objectively assessed housing need' (OAHN) calculation for the Parish.....policy should be amended to delete reference to OAHN. In it current form client objects to Policy 1.	Policy 1.1a) has been amended to reflect the needs of the aging population identified in the Rural Area Profile (Rural Place Profile Oct 2013) and the needs identified by AVBC as district 's requirements.
<b>3.40</b>		Planning Policy 2 – client supports policy of Protected Open Land as set out in Saved Policy EN5.	Support welcomed
<b>3.41</b>		Planning Policy 3 – supports creation of community park in Swanwick. Client best placed to assist in delivery... will only come about if funded through development process	Will require consideration as part of the planning process.
<b>3.42</b>		Planning Policy 4 – client supports Policy 4 to enhance and extend open space and green corridors	Support welcomed
<b>3.43</b>		Planning Policy 5 – client supports	Support welcomed
<b>3.44</b>		Planning Policy 6 - client supports	Support welcomed
<b>3.45</b>		Planning Policy 7 – client generally supports but requirements of 7.2 and appendix C are too prescriptive	Sets the standard expected

**Swanwick Parish Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement**

<b>Para Ref.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Consultation Comment</b>	<b>Swanwick Parish Council Response</b>
<b>3.46</b>		Planning Policy 8 – client supports Policy 8 Protecting the Historic Centre	Support welcomed
<b>3.47</b>		Planning Policy 9 – not supported. Reference to village centre should be deleted.	Policy 9 encourages new facilities in the village centre; this is to support the existing population and reflects existing shortages of community space for local people who see the village centre as shown in map 6.
<b>3.48</b>		Planning Policy 10 – supports the principle but not the detail.... SMHA ....does not provide a specific house type mix for Swanwick	Retained but with amendments to reflect evidence from Area Profile (Rural Place Profile Report Oct 2013)
<b>3.49</b>		Planning Policy 11 – client supports this policy	Support welcomed
<b>3.50</b>		Planning Policy 12 – client feels policy lacks ambition & only deals with small scale local businesses.....Policy should be amended to recognise the employment potential at Lily Street Farm.	NP is not a mini local plan and SPC felt that land for major employment should be dealt with at district level especially as there is such uncertainty about the amount of land required etc  Policy 12 recognises the local residents’ support for the need to support small scale businesses within the area. It does not reflect either way on the provision of large employment premises.
<b>4.1 onwards</b>		Planning application details	The remainder of the Signet response is about the Lilly Street application and is not relevant in considering responses to the NP.