

## Q7 What comments do you wish to make on this policy area? Please use specific policy reference numbers wherever appropriate.

Answered: 32 Skipped: 24

#	Responses	Date
1	Natural England also welcomes policy CLU2 Green Corridors which states that proposals which help to connect the nationally important wildlife sites linked to Castor Hanglands but spreading across the parish, and to develop landscape features such as trees and hedgerows, and pond restoration, along with appropriate buffer zones, will be strongly encouraged.	2/20/2017 8:57 AM
2	Policy Area2 Land Use Milton is wholly supportive of the protection for the - ancient and fragile landscape to which you refer. Milton considers that all sites which have sensitive areas for nature conservation should benefit from a buffer zone in connection with any proposed development. This should be parish wide in our view. It should also include sensitive areas lying just outside the parish boundaries, but whose buffers zone would fall within the parish. Milton recognises the part that it plays in management of land as well as by those who occupy land under agricultural tenancy agreement. Milton has a keen interest in conservation of heritage assets and aside from direct involvement maintaining listed buildings etc. has in the past made contributions to St Kyneburgha's Preservation Trust and more recently to a project to make Robin Hood and Little John Stones more open to public view. In Policy CLU 1 - we favour the 500 meter buffer extending to any sites of nature conservation importance as previously outlined	2/20/2017 8:46 AM
3	CLU1 Environmental Impact The policy states that new development should not harm local ecological features and that: 'Development proposals that will have an adverse effect on these sites will not be permitted.' This is a more stringent test than policy within the NPPF (paragraph 109) which states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: "minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible". Development of Great Kyne will conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the principles of paragraph 118 (mitigation hierarchy) and other relevant policies in chapter 11 of the NPPF (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment). The final clause in CLU1 states that: 'Any proposals for an increase in dwellings within 500m around either Castor Hanglands or Oldfield Pond must include a strong and robust justification with proportionate evidence demonstrating how any impacts will be managed or mitigated to make the development acceptable.' Protections for sites of special scientific interest (SSSI) exist already under various pieces of legislation and regulatory regimes (including land use planning). It is unclear what this policy provides over and above existing national policy and legislation. The legislative regime governing sites of SSSIs is well understood by local planning authorities. For example, SSSIs benefit from Impact Risk Zones which seek to guide consultations relating to the likely impacts of development on SSSIs under Schedule 4(w) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and section 28I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Similarly PCC have screened for requirements relating to the Habitats Regulations . It is unnecessary to add an additional SSSI buffer zone or policy into a neighbourhood plan in addition to national and Peterborough-wide policy protections. CLU2 Green corridors The HCA welcome the identification of these green corridors and would welcome further conversations to develop the precise locations as design of the Great Kyne masterplan emerges. The HCA request that the policy makes clear that buffer zones should, where practicable, reflect national guidance from the Environment Agency and Natural England. CLU3 Local green spaces Appendix 1 details the extent of the HCA's landholding. Whilst the principle of the Local Green Space Designation is supported, the HCA would wish to discuss with you further how designation would relate with the plans for establishing a Country Park north of the settlement boundary and south of the A47. CLU4 Protection of archaeological heritage It is unclear what this policy adds to existing content within the NPPF chapter 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) and emerging PCC Local Plan (Policy LP19: Heritage Assets). 'The Distribution and Significance of Archaeological Sites' (Upex 2016) is a detailed report that shall be shared with our appointed heritage specialists. The HCA shall consider the key assets and features to inform the future planning of the Great Kyne allocation and associated masterplan.	2/19/2017 3:22 PM
4	CLU1 Environmental Impact Agree totally CLU2 Green Corridors Very important to protect our wildlife CLU3 Local green spaces Under no circumstances should building be allowed CLU4 Protection of Archaeological Heritage Agree.	2/17/2017 9:28 PM
5	Agree	2/17/2017 7:28 PM
6	Agree	2/17/2017 7:19 PM
7	This area should be used for farming. This area should not be used for any form of housing or business development.	2/17/2017 6:11 PM
8	I fully support the views expressed in the Plan regarding land use in and around Castor and Ailsworth, particularly the use of brownfield sites and the protection of green spaces.	2/17/2017 1:52 PM

<p>9</p>	<p>Policy CLU1 Environmental Impact ↘ Whilst the principle of this policy is understood, there are a number of issues with it: 1. The first paragraph should be reworded to be more aligned to national policy; 2. The second paragraph has a number of issues and should be amended and part of it deleted; 3. The reference to Map 4 in the second paragraph of the policy is incorrect as this map shows proposed Local Green Spaces; and 6 Section / Policy Comments 4. The third part of the policy, is generally acceptable, but Oldfield pond is not a protected site and so impacts cannot be measured. These are addressed in turn below. ↘ The first part of the policy would benefit from some additional wording at the end to bring it more in line with national policy, such as "If a development is likely to result in an unacceptable impact on existing features, adequate mitigation should be included to deliver a net gain in biodiversity." ↘ In the second paragraph there is no concern with the principle, however, the second and third sentences should be more aligned to national policy, particularly paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Furthermore, these two sentences would benefit from being merged with the third paragraph of the policy. See comments below against the third paragraph for suggested reworking. ↘ The last sentence of the second paragraph in this policy is not, in its present form, appropriate or deliverable. The Oldfield Pond is not a protected site and it is not owned by the Council, so there can be no assurance about the delivery of any improvement. However, it is acknowledged that the pond may have some historical importance (as a possible water source for the Roman settlement, for example) as well as some wildlife benefits. . It is suggested the sentence be amended and added to the third paragraph. ↘ The third paragraph should be amended, incorporating most of the second paragraph. The third paragraph could read: "Nationally, regionally and locally designated wildlife sites will be protected. Any proposals that would result in an unacceptable impact on a protected site will not be permitted unless it can be adequately mitigated or any benefits would clearly outweigh the harm, taking into account the status of the site being affected. Any proposals for an increase in dwellings within 500m of Castor Hanglands SSSI must include an assessment of impacts, demonstrating how any adverse impacts will be managed or mitigated to make the proposal acceptable. Additionally, any development proposals which are in the vicinity of the non-designated pond known as Oldfield Pond in the plantation south of Belsize Farm (indicatively identified on Map 2) should appraise the pond's current biodiversity and historic value, and, if appropriate to do so, incorporate the pond within the design proposal and preserve or enhance the pond's value." Policy CLU2 Green Corridors ↘ The wording of the first paragraph should be amended in order for it to be deliverable and so that it refers to the correct map (it should be Map 3). It should also ensure that consistent terminology is used between the map and the policy, i.e. green corridor or wildlife corridor, not both. ↘ The second paragraph in the policy would also benefit from some rewording to ensure it is usable in practice. The rewording of this policy could be as follows: "The wildlife corridors identified on Map 3 should be preserved and where possible enhanced. Any proposal that would sever an identified wildlife corridor will be resisted, unless a suitable alternative route for the corridor can be delivered. Proposals should, wherever possible and relevant, deliver strong green links between Castor Hanglands and other protected sites, both inside and outside of the neighbourhood area, including through incorporating new and existing trees, hedgerows and other features." 7 Section / Policy Comments Policy CLU3 Local Green Spaces ↘ It should be noted that there are no Local Green Spaces currently designated Peterborough and there will be none until the Local Plan is adopted. As such, unless you want to wait for the Local Plan to be adopted, you will need to justify their designation in your plan in order for it to be considered by the examiner. The emerging Local Plan is supported by a Local Green Space Evidence Report, available on the PCC website and this can form the basis of the justification should you wish to include them in the neighbourhood plan. The wording of the first part of the policy will need to be adjusted in order to reflect any changes made. ↘ The second part of the policy is not clear, and therefore not appropriate in its current format. It does not make it clear if the sites are being allocated as local green space or as a different designation, but does seek to apply the same level of protection that a local green space would receive. If these additional sites are being proposed as local green space, there will need to be substantial justification. If they are not proposed as Local Green Space designations, but as a different designation, this should be made clear with a more appropriate wording to cover how these will be treated. ↘ In respect of the Woodlands Site in particular, which PCC is landowner, we object to its inclusion as a Local Green Space (if that is indeed what you are proposing), as it does not meet national policy for such status. There is also conflict between this policy and policy CRV1 and as such it is recommended that the Woodlands site is removed from this policy. ↘ More generally, have owners of the sites been consulted on these designations? It is essential that they have, given the impact on their land. ↘ The last paragraph in the policy could be missed by applicants as it is not something that only relates to Local Green Spaces. It should either be moved (to CH1 perhaps?) or the title of the policy should be amended to be clear that it is not only relating to Local Green Spaces, but other open spaces too. Map 4 ↘ The word 'Local' is misspelt. ↘ Why is Woodlands drawn out in the title from the other proposed Local Why is Woodlands drawn out in the title from the other proposed Local Green Spaces? Policy CLU4 Protection of Archaeological Heritage ↘ This policy is considered to be broadly suitable. It may be beneficial to add to this policy to ensure that it can be properly applied. It is recommended that it is reworded to: "Where relevant, development proposals should demonstrate how the archaeological and historic features within the parish, identified in the report "The Distribution and Significance of Archaeological Sites" (Upex 2016), will be evaluated and documented, have been taken into account in the design of the scheme, and how no unacceptable impact on these features will result. The key areas analysed in the report are shown in Map 5, with the detail contained</p>	<p>2/17/2017 10:33 AM</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Policy CLU3 Local Green Spaces, page 35 of plan, Sports Field at Woodlands, Splash Lane. With Nene Park Trust haven taken back the land and a promise to keep the sports fields but apparently letting &gt;50% for a minimum of 8 prestigious houses/care home to be built (info from comments of local businessman) does the plan need to be amended to reflect this recent change?</p>	<p>2/17/2017 9:22 AM</p>

11	The loss of habitat for local brown hares and gate keeper butterflies, that I see on my spring and summer walks, to the backdrop of sky larks, singing above me.	2/16/2017 9:35 PM
12	CLU1 We are pleased that Policy CLU1 Environmental impact has been included within the draft plan as it will ensure that new development will maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourses, ponds, hedgerows and tree-lines). CLU3 The parish should be aware there are some main rivers (Castor Splash and Castor Splash Lane) adjacent to the built development that have not had their floodplains determined as their catchments are less than 3km2. Policy CLU3 Local green spaces of the draft plan should protect Castor Splash Lane as the Woodlands local green space is recognised as of high amenity value on which development will not be permitted, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated	2/16/2017 2:05 PM
13	I support the policy content	2/15/2017 8:36 PM
14	I support the policy content	2/15/2017 8:31 PM
15	CLU3 and CRV1 (Also see policy area 4) The only specific comment the Trust would put forward is clarification of policies CLU3 and CRV1 and Map 4 in relation to Woodlands, Splash Lane. The text in CLU3 refers to the value of the sports pitches at Woodlands and in recognition of this that no development would be permitted without exceptional circumstances. Map 4 showing local green space includes the pitches and also the building of woodlands along with curtilage and areas of hard standing. Text in policy CRV1 states that limited development of Woodlands would be supported. Map 4 needs to be corrected to represent this by only highlighting the sports pitches as local green space and excluded the eastern third of the site - as per the plan provided to the Clerk for information. We are happy with the proposed designation for the cricket pitches, but not for the Woodlands building and curtilage including the car park, tennis court, bowling green and all weather pitch to be included within this designation. We have welcomed the opportunity to feed in to this plan and continue to be open to contribute	2/15/2017 2:56 PM
16	CLU2 The proposed buffer zone around Castor Hanglands should also apply to the woodland South of Manor House Upton. This is a protected wood and development should not be allowed close by.	2/15/2017 2:21 PM
17	That I support the content of my parish Neighbourhood Plan	2/15/2017 1:51 PM
18	I support the content of my parish neighbourhood plan.	2/14/2017 9:33 PM
19	Support the plan as written	2/14/2017 11:25 AM
20	I support the content of our parish neighbourhood plan	2/13/2017 8:15 PM
21	I support the position of Protect Rural Peterborough as detailed in their letter of 8/2/17	2/13/2017 6:52 PM
22	We fully support the content of your parish Neighbourhood Plan	2/12/2017 6:09 PM
23	Thank you for consulting the Wildlife Trust on the Castor and Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plans. The Wildlife Trust supports the overall direction of these Parish Plans and the proposed visions and objectives for each plan. We are broadly supportive of the policies, including those for Land Use. We do however have the following suggestions which we believe might represent further improvements to the draft policies, as well as correcting some inaccuracies. The proposed changes are shown in red text. Castor Neighbourhood Plan Policy CLU1 – Environmental Impacts Paragraph 1 – no comment Paragraph 2 – amend as follows: "Developments that incorporate measures to sustain wildlife will be encouraged. In particular, Castor Hanglands SSSI and other related nationally and regionally important wildlife sites, identified on Map 3 will be protected,. Development proposals that will have an adverse effect on these site will not be permitted. Additionally the pond known as Oldfield Pond in the plantation south of Belsize Farm (OS grid ref: TF132002: see Map 2) requires protection and enhancement. Paragraph 3 – amend as follows "Any proposals for an increase in dwellings within 500 metres around either Castor Hanglands or Oldfield Pond will not be permitted. Any proposals for an increase of dwellings between 500 metres and 1 Km of Castor Hanglands and within 500 metres of Oldfield Pond must include a strong and robust justification with proportionate evidence demonstrating how any impacts will be managed or mitigated to make the development acceptable. REASON: To strengthen the policy and make it more related to available evidence. The Wildlife Trust The Manor House Broad Street Great Cambourne Cambridge CB23 6DH Tel: 01954 713500 Fax: 01954 710051 Map 3 The Wildlife Trust suggests that this map is amended to show all the SSSIs and County Wildlife Sites (CWS) within the Parish, to accord with the policy working above. There are ten CWS in Castor Parish (Belsize Wood, Blackthorn Spinney, Brake's Wood & White's Spinney, Bushy Wood, Castor Village Meadows, Clay and Cow Lanes, East Holmes, Milton Park, and Popple's Coppice). Policy CLU2 Green corridors Paragraph 1 - Change Map 2 to Map 3 Paragraph 2 – amend as follows: "Proposals which help to connect the nationally important wildlife sites linked to of Castor Hanglands but spreading across the parish and Castor Flood Meadows to the other regionally and locally important wildlife sites within the parish and beyond its boundaries, and to develop landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, and ponds restoration, along with other appropriate buffer zones and stepping stones, will be strongly encouraged. REASON: To make the policy wording more coherent and better linked to the emerging Peterborough Green Infrastructure and biodiversity strategy.	2/10/2017 2:24 PM

24	Policy CLU3 Local green spaces There are existing foul sewers located within area identified as Woodlands on Map 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan. It would be helpful if the Neighbourhood Plan explained in what circumstances development would be acceptable for this area of land. As part of which it would be helpful to include reference to utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water	2/4/2017 1:47 PM
25	3. Castor Hanglands is so close to the proposed site, with all of it's bio-diversity and endangered birds species (8 species on the Red Data List and so in need of the highest protection), and so this is perhaps my biggest objection to the plan – the animals there cannot be removed like the Hampton newts, and introducing that many homes (and associated domestic cats) to this area can only have a negative impact on one of the jewels of this rural setting, that your policy is in place to preserve – and that as such should be protected by Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act of 2006.	1/30/2017 4:15 PM
26	I fully agree the clauses and am aware of sufficient available plots to meet the limited expansion warranted.	1/29/2017 2:16 PM
27	The land is unspoilt green land. within the peterborough and its surrounding industrial areas there is significant amounts of down land that could be redelivered to the same capacity as is being proposed here.	1/17/2017 2:32 PM
28	I support all of the policies listed under this section. Land use should take into account environmental impact on the area (policy CLU1). Green corridors and green space should be protected (CLu2 & CLU3) and most importantly our unique archaeological heritage in the valley should be protected and safeguarded for future generations (policy CLU4)	1/17/2017 1:07 PM
29	strongly agree with policies especially concerning the protection of archeological heritage. The history of the whole Castor area is rich going back the the bronze age and is especially an important in Roman history on a national scale	1/17/2017 9:55 AM
30	I agree with the policy	1/16/2017 5:44 PM
31	I agree with the points in 6.2.1 on Land Use, drawing particular attention to 6.2.1.4, that we don't want a repeat of past mistakes. Castor Hanglands, Oldfield Pond CLU2 and 3 and 4 Agree 6.2.4. Very important that the environment is protected from future development. Castor Hanglands, Oldfield Pond and all the archaeological sites must be preserved for future generations and are a great amenity for Peterborough in its pursuit of being an Environment City.	1/16/2017 5:15 PM
32	CLU1 We particularly support the provision for the protection of Castor Hanglands and Oldfield Pond by limiting ant housing to within 500m of these sites. However we feel that a distance of 750m would afford a more appropriate level of protection given its significant level of biodiversity which I under threat and diminishing elsewhere. CLU2 Agree with the need to strengthen green corridors to support and enhance biodiversity. CLU3 Agree strongly with the green areas identified as they are key to maintaining the villages character and identity. CLU4 Agree	1/14/2017 4:56 PM