

BERKSWELL PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Summary of representations received at Regulation 16 stage (Submission)

In accordance with Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendum) Regulations 2012 (as amended), the following table comprises a summary of the representations received to the Submission Draft Berkswell Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

All of the representations summarised below will be considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and making recommendations on the Berkswell Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Representations received to the submission consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner		
Respondent	Support/ Object/ Comment	Summary of Representation
A Bland	Object	<p>Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane</p> <p>Parish Council has no right to determine how land owned by Catholic Church should be used. The land has never been public recreation land, although the Church has allowed its use for activities such as football from time to time as a good will gesture, and for informal dog exercising. A fence has been erected recently to combat misuse whilst enabling access to Barretts Lane. There is a growing need for residential and assisted living accommodation and the Church has indicated a wish to use the land for this purpose, which would be far more productive than dog walking.</p>
Balsall Parish Council	Comment	<p>The Plan area conjoins Balsall Parish Neighbourhood Area and Balsall Common straddles the boundary and provides facilities for both area’s populations. Development of policies requires evidence of the settlements’ needs. There is no comprehensive assessment of community infrastructure needs and Appendix 5 does not make clear whether the suggestions relate to the Parish Area as a whole or just the part of Balsall Common within it. Future community needs of the entire Balsall Common settlement should be taken into account in any recommendations for CIL benefit.</p> <p>Policies B1 and B2: Housing Needs and Affordable Housing</p> <p>There is no evidence of local housing needs and paragraphs 6.6-6.8 do not clearly cover needs to create as policy. Given the level of Borough wide affordable housing need and the attractiveness of the area, it would be prudent to address affordable housing issue.</p> <p>Policies B3, B4, B5 and B6: Environment</p> <p>It would be helpful to include an assessment of special value to the community from the evidence to support the inclusion of the Local Green Spaces.</p>

		<p>Policies B7, B8 and B9: Accessibility and Infrastructure Welcome the identification of parking at Berkswell rail station as inadequate for current and future needs.</p> <p>Policy B10: Economy Despite the response to the Issues and options consultation, the Plan doesn't make clear the dependency of the Parish Area on Balsall Common shopping area, or the level of provision required to meet local needs. There is no recognition that the desire for a business community hub relates to the wider settlement and adjoining Parish Area.</p>
Barrett's Farm Neighbourhood Action Group	Support	The Parish Council has undertaken a thorough investigation of the wishes of the community and has produced a Plan that reflects the community's views.
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Rainier Developments	Support / Comment	<p>Support the objectives of the Plan, including the need to deliver housing and protect the landscape character.</p> <p>Policy B1: New Housing Uncertain whether focus on brownfield land alone can meet housing needs and suggest changes to detailed policy to provide flexibility; Criterion 2b, g and j – avoid prescriptiveness about closes and culs de sac, provide play areas where required only, and revise the requirement for open space or a 30m buffer between existing and new development, which is overly restrictive and conflicts with the NPPF requirement to make effective use of land. Criterion 3d - avoid prescriptiveness about need for open space Criterion 4c and e – electric vehicle charging points may be better provided within garages, and policy should specify suitable storage for waste bins (and cycles) rather than require them in gardens. Criterion 5a – wording on housing mix should be amended to as appropriate or required, as not all sites will be suitable for all types.</p> <p>Policy B3: Landscape and Built Character The NDP can release Green Belt for housing, where a need for boundary changes has been established through strategic policies. Landscape Character criterion 1 – the area to the east of Balsall Common is in a different character area to the rest of the settlement's surroundings, being heavily influenced by suburban development and development in this area could help to define the settlement edge. Heritage Assets criterion 2 - inconsistent with the NPPF as it offers greater protection to non-designated heritage assets. Plan should consider land south of Waste Lane on the east of Balsall Common as a housing allocation.</p>
Berkswell Society	Support	Considers that the Plan has a very high level of support within the Parish Area and fully supports the policies and other community aspirations and objectives in the Plan.

B Jones	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane The land is clearly not public recreation land, although the Church has allowed its use for activities such as football from time to time and for a dog walking area. A fence has been erected recently in view of the Parish Council’s insistence in including this land as a green space. The Church has put forward a proposal for assisted living accommodation and recognises that it will only be developed if there are no brownfield sites available. The field does not qualify as a special area, worthy of classification as a green space.
Burton Green Parish Council	Comment	Welcomes the objective to improve vehicular traffic flows throughout the Parish Area, and notes that the junction between Waste Lane and Hodgetts Lane is highlighted by a red spot on the accompanying map. However, there is no mention of this junction in the supporting text. (NB. Refers to Map 6 on page 56, and red spot represents the location of a housing allocation in the Solihull Draft Local Plan)
C J Ellis	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Parish Council has no right to determine how land owned by Catholic Church should be used. The land has never been public recreation land, and there are ample recreational areas around Balsall Common for informal walking and dog exercising..
C Burleigh	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane The land is clearly not public recreation land, although the Church has allowed its use in the past for activities such as football, and for a dog walking area. Recreational space should be provided as part of the adjacent proposed housing development. The NDP is the work of interested parties, and the proposed designation makes false representation of the nature and usage of this private land
C McSorley	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane The field is owned and used by the Church for many years, although the Church has allowed its use for activities such sport and for walking. It has also been used to exercise dogs. The Church has put forward a proposal for assisted living accommodation to meet people’s needs, and the Church’s proposal is supported.
The Coal Authority	Comment	No comments to make on the NP.
D and M Green	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane This is an attempt to derail the draft housing allocation in the emerging Solihull Local Plan Review, proposed following detailed assessment. The field does not meet the required criteria for local green space, is not public recreation land, and is not demonstrably special. The Church has allowed its use for activities such as football in the past, and for a dog walking area and occasional community events.
E Clarke	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane The Plan fails to demonstrate that this land meets the requirements for local green space. There is little evidence to support the claim that it has high recreational value, as it is used mainly for dog walking, which has no particular

		significance, and the public right of way is protected anyway. It is not demonstrably special as it does not meet the guidelines to be considered for its tranquil nature and is only identified in the Ecological Report as of medium value. The Church has put forward a proposal for assisted living accommodation, for which it is ideally situated, being close to shops and other facilities, and which would meet a growing need, and the Church's proposal is supported.
E Timperley-Preece	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Would prefer to see site purchased by SMBC for use as recreation ground/park for the community. Supports the aim of the Church to create residential/assisted living in order to provide suitable homes and care for older residents within the village, but would be concerned about the impact of such a use on this site on traffic levels and speeds in Meeting House Lane. If development is proposed, there should be appropriate access and the careful management of speed and traffic on surrounding roads, before it is undertaken.
E Selby and family	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Parish Council has no right to determine how land owned by Catholic Church should be used. The land has never been public recreation land, although in the past there was a children's playground, the site is mainly used for informal dog exercising. There is a growing need for residential and assisted living accommodation and the Church has indicated a wish to use the land for this purpose, which would be far more productive than dog walking.
Environment Agency	Comment	Recommends inclusion of policies to safeguard land at risk of flooding from allocated sites or future windfalls, identifying necessary mitigation measures taking account of climate change. NDP should identify River Blythe as a major feature and consider other watercourses such as the ordinary watercourse running SW to NW across the Parish Area. Policy should ensure that development creates space for water and contributes to blue and green infrastructure, that flood risk associated with any allocated sites and opportunities to reduce flood risk elsewhere are identified, that there is an 8 metre set back from watercourses, that all SuDs features are located outside 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood extent, and that culverted watercourses are opened up and unnecessary obstructions removed. Recommends policy requiring contributions to the flood risk management scheme proposed in the Upper Brookstray catchment from development in NE of Plan Area. Take account of recorded landfill sites, including Meriden Quarry and Lavender Hall Farm and ensure preliminary risk assessments are undertaken for any brownfield sites likely to be contaminated so that development can be safely managed. Policy B1: New Housing Criterion 3a – where features cannot be retained, require suitable mitigation planting with native and local

		<p>provenance sourced species and hedgerow restoration.</p> <p>Criterion 3c – strengthen to ensure all development takes place in areas of flood zone 1, or follows sequential approach, that greenfield development sites do not exceed greenfield surface water run off rate, and brownfield deliver a substantial reduction in existing run off rate and reduce where possible to equivalent greenfield rate.</p> <p>New criterion 3e – to identify sites and incorporate features such as natural flood management to slow flood water.</p> <p>Criterion 6b – add for example hedgehog garden highways, restoration of hedgerows and river and stream habitat, restriction of any lighting of pathways to minimise impact of biodiversity, and removal of invasive species.</p> <p>Policy B3: Landscape and Built Character – Landscape Character</p> <p>Criterion 2 – add mitigation measures to ensure net gain for biodiversity.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – landscape habitat management plan defining whom is responsible for achieving it.</p> <p>Policy B7: Car Parking Facilities at Berkswell Station</p> <p>Development proposals should avoid area outside flood zone 1 and area in flood zone 3 particularly. Add reference to using native local provenance sourced features and incorporating SuDs features.</p>
Historic England	Support	<p>Supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it. Note that the Plan evidence base is well informed by reference to the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record and includes an historic landscape analysis.</p> <p>The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness through good design and the protection of heritage assets, archaeological remains, local green space and important views, along with landscape character through the retention of the “Meriden Gap” is to be applauded.</p> <p>The plan reads overall as a well written, well-considered and fit for purpose document. Consider that an exemplary approach is taken to the historic environment of the Parish and that the Plan constitutes a very good example of community led planning.</p>
I & F Lester	Comment / Object	<p>Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane</p> <p>Site has not been used for many years for recreation, and its use by some for dog exercising does not mean that it is not private land. Support the proposal by the Church for provision of sheltered/assisted living accommodation due to increasing need, quiet but central location, and priority over dog walking.</p>
I Clarke	Comment / Object	<p>Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane</p> <p>Land belongs to Church and is not common land, green space or a recreation ground. It is used for dog walking, and has on occasion been used for community activities. Support the proposal by the Church for provision of residential/assisted living accommodation due to increasing need and priority over dog walking.</p>
I Gibbons	Comment / Object	<p>Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane</p> <p>Land is only used for dog walking. Support the proposal by the Church for provision of residential/assisted</p>

		accommodation.
J Cairns	Support	Impressed with aims and concerns of the NDP, which would be of long term benefit to the Parish. Policy B4: Local Green Spaces Support provision of green spaces, green belt and rural character. Policy B8: Car Parking and Cycle Storage Support approach to off-street car parking for new housing which is innovative and recognises car commuting nature of settlement.
WB and JA Gibbs	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and has not been used as recreation land for years, despite occasional activities. Land originally intended for a school, but needs have changed and support proposal for residential/assisted living accommodation, as greater priority than for dog walking.
K Driffield	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Whilst Church and youth group activities have been held on the land, it is not really suitable for recreation, other than dog walking. Support the proposal by the Church for provision of residential/assisted living accommodation due to increasing need.
K Jones	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and the Parish Council declined an opportunity to purchase it many years ago. It has not been used as recreation land for years, despite historic use for playground and playing pitch. Alternatively recreational facilities at the Lant Trust ground and in Lavender Hall Park are a short walk away. Support the proposal by the Church which would cause minimal disruption, and provide much needed assisted living accommodation.
M Peat	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Support the proposal by the Church for much needed sheltered/assisted living accommodation in a suitable location. Land is private and has never been a recreational ground, despite occasional use in the past, and the public right of way will be maintained.
M Burleigh	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and any occasional goodwill use was discontinued years ago. Land always intended to be used for some type of development, for the benefit of residents and Church attendees. Using the land for open space may enable an adjoining developer to evade responsibility for provision, and demonstrate bias on behalf of the Parish Council.
M Fairbrother	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and whilst it has been used for a local football team and for other occasional activities, there was never an intention to re-designate the land as recreational. Support the proposal

		by the Church for much needed sheltered/assisted living accommodation, which will serve community better than maintaining dog walking or market housing.
Natural England	Comment	No specific comments on the draft NDP, although provides general guidance on information sources, issues and ways to improve the natural environment.
Network Rail	Comment	No specific comments, but highlights need for transport assessments and notification to Network Rail for certain developments.
N Driffield	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is unusable for recreation, due to impact of dog walkers and has not been used for years, is poorly drained, and its future use is a matter for the Church not the Parish Council.
P Martin	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and its use on an occasional basis may have given the impression it was recreation land. There is now an opportunity for development, as part of housing development for much needed accommodation for older persons, on land that is of little value. There are other areas of open space available.
Richard Brown on behalf of Colchurch Properties Ltd	Support /Comment	Support vision and objectives of NDP. Policy B1: New Housing Support the criteria in the policy and confirms that the emerging masterplan for Draft Local Plan Site 1, which is within Berkswell Parish, has sought to address relevant parts.
R Murtagh	Comment / Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and retaining its use will not create the impression of green space. Support proposal for much needed residential/assisted living accommodation on the site.
RPS on behalf of Barwood Land	Comment / Object	Plan period should reflect that of the emerging Solihull Local Plan, but it is likely that the latter will need to run to 2035 at the earliest. The NDP should include specific dates for monitoring and triggers to ensure that it is reviewed within a defined timeframe. Vision Unclear what is meant by protecting the rural environment, which should not prevent non-rural development, and should recognise that the Solihull Local Plan Review may seek to make additional housing allocations within the Green Belt in the area. Policy B1: New Housing <i>Brownfield Sites</i> Principle that brownfield sites should come forward before greenfield goes beyond NPPF, which encourages re-use of brownfield land, and first consideration of brownfield land where Green Belt release is necessary. Wording should be consistent with NPPF by stating that brownfield land or land well served by public transport should be

		<p>encouraged and given first consideration, and this should be reflected in paragraph 7.2.</p> <p><i>Layouts and Accessibility</i> Criteria b and c are too restrictive and could lead to poorer design and cohesiveness on sites. Criterion j could create difficulties of social integration and delivery of meaningful open space. The requirement in criterion k that development should incorporate principles of secured by design should be deleted as there is no evidence of a particular issue with crime. These criteria should be replaced by; Proposals should be supported by information explaining how the design and layout will facilitate social cohesion and community safety and security.</p> <p><i>Landscaping and Drainage</i> Criterion a should be amended to recognise that not all mature trees and hedgerows are worthy of retention and to require production of site specific tree surveys.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 6.1 and Appendix A</i> The proposed strategic sites referred to and shown in the appendix should be removed, and a statement included that the NDP is not making any housing allocations.</p> <p>Policy B3: Landscape and Built Character <i>Landscape Character</i> Criteria 2 seeks to apply blanket protection to heritage assets, but policy should reflect the different status of the features listed,</p> <p><i>Heritage Assets</i> Criteria 2 should be amended to remove the reference to ‘great’ weight and only apply this to the conservation of a designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Policy B8: Car Parking and Cycle Storage Requirement for 4/5 parking spaces for 4 and 5 bedroom houses is not justified, is inconsistent with current local parking standards, and no evidence justifies a departure from those standards.</p> <p>Appendix 2 Definition of affordable housing should be replaced with the definition in the NPPF 2018.</p>
Reverend O’Connor on behalf of the Archdiocese of Birmingham	Object	<p>Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Requests removal of policy seeking to designate land as a Local Green Space, as the land does not pass the tests for designation in NPPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is demonstrably special because of its beauty or historic significance. • Heavy reliance is made by the Parish Council on the recreational value of the site. Whilst the Church has had no reason to safeguard the property by withholding access in the past, the potential designation has resulted

		<p>in the Church reconsidering, and the site is no longer publically accessible, aside from the public footpath link, and has no recreational value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence has been provided to support the claim of tranquillity, which by its very nature is a rural concept. • The site is described in the ecological evidence as having medium distinctiveness, which is insufficient to justify designation, whilst sites with greater wildlife value have not been proposed for designation. The Parish Council has indicated that these were not considered due to Green Belt status, but the Church land is also in the Green Belt. <p>The site is part of a strategic allocation in the Draft Local Plan, which is supported with the site available for delivery.</p>
S Noonan	Comment / Object	<p>Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned and not a dog walking or local recreational area, and there are ample recreational facilities. Support the proposal by the Church for much needed assisted living accommodation</p>
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	Support / Object / Comment	<p>Policy B1: New Housing Criterion 2e - a requirement for grass verges may inhibit more efficient use of land. It may be preferable to focus on strategic green space provision within development contributing to wider green infrastructure, rather than seeking verges on all longer roads. Criterion 2j - should apply specifically to new allocations on the edge of Balsall Common, rather than infill development, where it would impact on density and efficient use of land. Criterion 3c - would be improved by inserting 'limit surface water discharges to the greenfield Qbar rate. The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and permeable surfaces is essential, unless demonstrated that they are inappropriate' at the end of the second sentence. Criterion 3d - Policy could be more positive in promoting hedgerow planting, as part of wider strategic green space and green infrastructure within developments, as well as within buffer zones. Criterion 4a - development incorporating 3 or more storeys will depend on the context and may not be inappropriate in accessible locations close to rail stations for example, and may contribute to urban design. Taller buildings may also help towards higher density development, thereby minimising pressure on land take. Criterion 6 - could be improved by a reference to achieving biodiversity gain from new development, given its inclusion in the latest NPPF, DEFRA's 25 year Environment Plan, and the Government consultation on Net Gain. Policy B3: Landscape and Built Character Built Character - could be enhanced by including a clause relating to traditional boundary treatments, encouraging hedgerows in particular, and low brick walls or other treatment appropriate to the existing character. Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane</p>

		<p>This land is included within the indicative area of Draft Local Plan Housing Site 1, and it is understood that the Church is seeking its development for housing. The Draft Local Plan is at an early stage and carries relatively little weight. It also makes clear that the boundaries of the indicative site are not fixed and will be subject to further work on master planning to take account of constraints, accommodate different land uses including green infrastructure and identify clear and logical green belt boundaries. The master planning process provides an opportunity for a comprehensive settlement between all the landowners involved, including the Church, to ensure that any landowner whose land is identified for open space is not disadvantaged. Therefore, the retention of this land as a Local Green Space would not be inconsistent with the master planning of Site 1.</p> <p>The land was not identified as a playing pitch, whether current or disused, in the Playing Pitch Assessment 2017, although this may be due to lack of information to support its inclusion. However, it is clearly used for informal recreation, and retaining a link through the site to the strategic green space to the north-east will be important to enhance connectivity.</p> <p>Policy B8: Car Parking and Cycle Storage</p> <p>The off-street parking standard may be excessive and work against the provision of higher densities. It potentially conflicts with the NPPF, which advises that local standards should only be imposed where there is clear and compelling justification that they are necessary to manage the local road network. Indeed the standard may be unnecessary given the criteria expressed earlier in the policy. A similar policy introducing a local parking standard for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath was recommended for deletion by the Neighbourhood Plan Inspector recently as more onerous than the Local Plan policy and guidance in the Vehicle Parking Standards and Green Travel Plans Supplementary Planning Document, and lacking in justification. The evidence suggests that there may be merit in a more stringent parking standard for Berkswell Parish. However, this should be part of a wider range of measures seeking to reduce on-street parking, including the promotion of car sharing.</p> <p>Policy B10: Supporting Local Businesses</p> <p>The policy presents an opportunity to encourage appropriate diversification/expansion of the local economy. This could be assisted by including specific reference to conversions or re-use for appropriate tourism facilities and possibly farm shops, as well as small scale businesses. Supporting homeworking and growth in businesses would also be aided by suitable investment in communication technologies, including broadband and mobile phone services. The latter is included in the Submission draft NDP explanatory text at paragraph 11.4, but inclusion in the policy would give it added weight.</p>
Tyler Parkes on behalf of West Midlands Police	Support	Supports the additional wording within the NDP recognising the importance of supporting safe and secure environments, specifically in paragraph 5.15, Objectives 3 and 12, Policy B1 2k, Policy B3 Heritage Assets 5, paragraph 10.28 and Appendix 5.

V O'Farrell	Comment / Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane This land has been used by the community for many years, including recreation use by local football teams and other community activities. Object to recent fencing off which prevents access and use by the community.
W Gault	Comment /Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Support inclusion of this proposal, as the land has been used by my family for many years, including informal recreation use. Object to recent fencing off which prevents access and use by the community.
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Comment	Suggest additions to align NDP with Local Plan, which emphasises need to address the decline in biodiversity and fragmentation of habitats and to restore and enhance green infrastructure. Policy B1: New Housing Section 6 on Natural Environment could be expanded to included features for hedgehogs, such as hedgehog houses and permeable barriers with 13x13cm holes at ground level. Policy B3: Landscape and Built Character Landscape Character point 3 – could highlight use of native species hedgerows and trees and grassy margins adjacent hedgerows, that support a wide range of wildlife.
Representations sent to Berkswell Parish Council		
A Fox	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Disappointed that Church has fenced off land to prevent public access when there is a proposal to designate the land as a Local Green Space.
A Shaw	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Agree with representation by K Shaw, namely fencing off of this land to prevent access is against the community's interest and shows a lack of respect for the NDP, which is seeking to designate the land as a Local Green Space.
C Joyner	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Disapproves the action to fence off the land that the NDP is seeking to designate as a Local Green Space.
E Silverman	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane The fencing off of the land will lead to reduction in green space and prevent its continued use, and conflicts with the proposal in the NDP to designate the land as a Local Green Space.
G Harrison	Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Objects to the action to fence off the land which has been used by residents for many years, in advance of the examination into the NDP which is seeking its designation as a Local Green Space.

J Edwards	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Regrets the action of the Church to fence off this land that is considered to be green space and at a time when the proposal in the NDP has yet to be formally considered.
J Martin	Object	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Objects to the proposal to designate this land as Local Green Space as it is privately owned and the Parish Councils have declined to purchase or maintain it. Support the proposal by the Church to seek development for residential and assisted living accommodation, which should be prioritised over informal recreation land and retains the public right of way.
J McGarry	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Objects to the action to fence off the land to prevent public access, in advance of the examination into the NDP which is seeking its designation as a Local Green Space.
K Shaw	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Fencing off of this land to prevent access is against the community's interest and shows a lack of respect for the NDP, which is seeking to designate the land as a Local Green Space.
M Morris	Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Upset by the fencing off of this area of green space that has been open for general use for at least 13 years and appeal for its designation as a Local Green Space.
M Watkinson	Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Supports the designation of the land as a Local Green Space, particularly with the proposal to build on adjacent land and in the light of withdrawal of a previous proposal following opposition from local residents.
M Watson	Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Supports the designation of the land as a Local Green Space, and objects to the fencing off of the land which has been used as a playing field by children for many years and to potential development.
P Joyner	Comment	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Disapproves the action to fence off the land that the NDP is seeking to designate as a Local Green Space.
S Silverman	Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Objects to the action to fence off the land that the NDP is seeking to designate as a much needed Local Green Space given adjacent development proposals and at a time when the NDP consultation is going on.
W Wilson	Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Objects to the action to fence off this important recreation land that the NDP is seeking to designate as a much needed Local Green Space being the only green space in the area at a time when the NDP consultation is going on and prior to its examination.

Late Representations		
A Stuart-Smith	Comment / Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land should be retained as open space so as to protect habitats and access.
B Riemer	Comment / Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land should be retained as open space.
C Goodman	Comment / Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land should be retained as open space and for recreation use.
G O'Regan	Objection	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Land is privately owned by the Church and Parish Council has no right to include proposal in NDP, which should be removed.
J Whittlesey	Comment / Support	Policy B4: Local Green Spaces – Site 1 Recreation Ground, Meeting House Lane Objects to loss of access to this green space.