

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

Answered: 43 Skipped: 54

#	Responses	Date
1	<p>The Plan fully recognises the ecological value of the surrounding area including Castor Hanglands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserve and Castor Flood Meadows SSSI. Natural England welcomes acknowledgement within the Plan of the need to protect and enhance the important, scarce and often sensitive habitats and species that these sites and the surrounding countryside support. We particularly support Policy ALU 1 Environmental impact which seeks to ensure that development will protect and enhance the ecological network. We welcome that developments that incorporate measures to sustain wildlife will be encouraged. In particular, we welcome that Castor Hanglands SSSI, and related nationally and regionally important wildlife sites, will be protected. Development proposals that will have an adverse effect on these sites will not be permitted. Natural England also welcomes policy ALU 2 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.</p>	2/28/2017 12:09 PM
2	<p>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 agreements. In Policy CLUI Milton favours the 500 meter buffer extending to any sites - of nature conservation importance as previously outlined.</p>	2/28/2017 12:04 PM
3	<p>ALU1 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 ALU1 states that: 'Any proposals for an increase in dwellings within 500m around Castor Hanglands SSSI 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 281 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. ALU2 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. ALU3 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. ALU4 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.</p>	2/28/2017 11:48 AM

4	<p>Policy ALU1 Environmental Impact ↗ Whilst the principle of this policy is understood, there are some issues with this policy: 1. The first paragraph should be reworded to be more aligned to national policy; 2. The third and fourth paragraphs would benefit from a rewording and merging together; and 3. The reference to Map 4 in the second paragraph of the policy is incorrect as this map shows proposed Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>6 Section / Policy Comments 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." ↗ It is recommended that the third and fourth paragraphs in this policy should be combined and reworded as follows: "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."</p> <p>Policy ALU2 Green Corridors ↗ The wording of the policy should be amended in order for it to be deliverable. 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 rewording of this policy could be as follows: "The wildlife corridors identified on Map 2 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."</p> <p>Policy ALU3 Local Green Spaces ↗ It should be noted that there are no Local Green Spaces currently designated in 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. ↗ Have owners of the sites been consulted on these designations? It is essential that they have, given the impact on their land. Map 3 ↗ The annotation on Map 3 refers to some Local Green Spaces being protected and others not being protected. This is not mentioned in the policy or supporting text. In order to avoid confusion, it is recommended that the annotations are rectified.</p> <p>Policy ALU4 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 7 Section / Policy Comments of the scheme, and how no unacceptable impact on these features will result. The key areas analysed in the report are shown in Map 4, with the detail contained in the report."</p>	2/17/2017 11:02 AM
5	ALU1: 500m is a very short distance. The plan should specify at least 1km. ALU2: Green corridors are a good concept but their position and how they will be developed to benefit wildlife needs to be more specific. ALU3: More detail about how these green spaces can be developed to promote bio-diversity should be included.	2/17/2017 10:12 AM
6	ALU1 Flood Risk We are pleased that Policy ALU1 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)In addition, we are pleased that the objective to keep future development within the existing built village area has been included as this will protect the River Nene and its floodplain.	2/17/2017 10:02 AM
7	Policy ALU1: 500 metres is a very short distance. The Neighbourhood Plan should argue for at least 1km. ALU2: The concept of green corridors is helpful but more detail is needed to about the location and how they will 'work' for wildlife. ALU3: More detail would be helpful in relation to how these areas could contribute to maximising biodiversity.	2/17/2017 9:19 AM
8	ALU2 We should maintain 500m buffer zone around the woods South of Upton. This is an important green space in the same way as Castor Hanglands.	2/15/2017 7:41 PM
9	I support the policies set out in the Neighbourhood plan. Taken as a whole, they will preserve and enhance much of what makes the area special.	2/15/2017 7:12 PM
10	6.2.1.1-6 Everything that is stated within this section I would support - it is outlined most clearly and succinctly. Ailsworth is in an unique position with such an abundance of wildlife both flora and fauna and its history. Any developments must ensure this heritage is maintained for future generations. Once gone it will be lost forever. From personal experience living in the outskirts of London where 'Green Belt' was to save the environment and this was repeatedly rescinded meant the loss of so much.	2/15/2017 3:43 PM
11	Affordable housing is needed. Recreational facilities for the young are needed. A school that can be extended so it doesn't damage the older part of the village is also needed so one that is located elsewhere on land to the north.	2/15/2017 3:11 PM

12	I think the important word here is 'fragile' when referring to the landscape. There have been so many developments around the country /world that have damaged wild life habitats. It is vital that this landscape is preserved as a rural landscape thus securing the wild life corridors between Castor Hanglands and Milton Park so protecting the biodiversity of our natural world around us that gives us such a beautiful place to live.	2/14/2017 4:01 PM
13	ALU1 I cannot stress how important it is to protect an area like the Hanglands. Once it is down graded by a large development nearby it could be lost forever. We are only saying we would want it protected by a cordon 500m around it -is that enough? Could we not ask for more? ALU2 We talk of strengthening and enhancing 'green corridors' but these are only shown as some dotted lines on the map. Should we not be more ambitious and designate much broader areas -especially one going right down to the Nene? This may be important if the time comes when we may wish to bargain with the council or developers on schemes that may offset the damage a new development would do to the landscape. We need more detail here.	2/14/2017 12:50 PM
14	Alu1 - I think the wording relating to potential development near to Hanglands needs to be stronger, in that within 500m of hanglands no development should be considered, over 500m a strong and robust justification should be required.	2/13/2017 9:37 PM
15	I support this policy but would prefer a stronger policy in relation to the 500m buffer around Castor Hanglands SSSI - I strongly believe that there should be no development within 500m and would apply the 'tests' in the current NP to development within 1km.	2/13/2017 9:06 PM
16	I support this policy.	2/13/2017 8:54 PM
17	ALU1 (6.2.1.2)The significant number and type of habitats for birds, animals and insects, so well described in this policy, must be preserved for current and future generations. Castor Hanglands and the Flood Meadows are both SSSI which must not be lost. They have provided exceptional opportunities for biodiversity, scientific and environmental research, historical and cultural detail and the pattern of our social history. We have learned from the past in order to support the future. (6.2.1.3) Building on agricultural fields will reduce local employment opportunities. Once a field is built on it can not be reclaimed. (6.2.1.4) Any large development bordering onto a SSSI is likely to introduce regular and easy human and domestic animal ingress which will, over time, destroy these environmentally and historically vital sites. ALU2 Green Corridors are vital to the existence of the wildlife identified and must be evident in any new development. Larger developments than those recommended will undoubtedly close off these corridors leaving us with an empty, sterile and organised township. ALU3 The green spaces identified are what helps to give the villages character and the residents a sense of wellbeing and joy. Filling in those spaces with buildings would close everyone in. Not good for mental health! ALU4 The archaeological and historic features within the parish are what provide us with richness. They encourage curiosity and creativity-things we strive to encourage in our children and in our future poets and artists.	2/13/2017 1:44 PM
18	I support	2/13/2017 12:28 PM
19	We fully support the content of your parish Neighbourhood Plan	2/12/2017 6:03 PM
20	I fully support the content of your parish Neighbourhood Plan	2/12/2017 5:56 PM
21	I support all of the statements in this section but would particularly comment on: ALU1: The significant number and range of habitats for animals, birds and insects to be found in the surrounding countryside and in particular Castor Hanglands is exceptionally well documented and highly regarded by scientists, environmentalists, archaeologists and historians to name but a few. Any development that is close enough or large enough to impinge negatively on these sites should never be allowed. It will encourage human and domestic animal ingress on a regular and large scale manner, plus any significant infrastructure to service such a development would destroy this land forever. Once lost we would never retrieve it. It would take little time to join the large development to Ailsworth and Castor and we would become subsumed into a suburb of extended Peterborough. ALU2 : In order to prevent the 'joining up of the dots' as above it is essential that we retain our green corridors and indeed enhance them in order to retain our special sites. Additionally we will be providing areas that residents in the city can 'escape' to for much needed fresh air and relaxation.	2/12/2017 5:17 PM
22	I agree with the plans vision	2/12/2017 5:06 PM

23	Dear Sarah Castor and Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plans 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.Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy Area 2 – Land Use Paragraph 6.2.1.4 – The Wildlife Trust suggests that nightingale are added to the list of key species noted at Castor Hanglands NNR, as this species would be susceptible to increased recreational disturbance. Policy ALU1 – 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 2 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. Map 2 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 six CWS in Ailsworth Parish (Ailsworth Marsh & Green Lane, Ailsworth Meadow South, Castor Hanglands non-SSSI, Ermine Street, Normangate River Meadows and Stamford et al Road Verges). Policy ALU2 Green corridors Paragraph 1 – amend sentence 2 as follows: "Proposals which help to connect the nationally important wildlife site linked to of Castor Hanglands but spreading across the parish 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. I hope that these comments are of help to the two parishes as they take forward their respective neighbourhood plans. The Wildlife Trust would be pleased to explain further our proposed changes and to provide ongoing advice and support to both parishes on the neighbourhood plans and the proposed community action plan. Yours sincerely Yours sincerely Martin Baker	2/10/2017 2:32 PM
24	A clear rural vision for this village at the foot of the limestone plateau	2/8/2017 8:28 AM
25	fully agreed	2/1/2017 12:39 PM
26	ALU3: Local green spaces There are existing Anglian Water assets located within a number of the designated local green spaces (LGS006, LGS008,LGS009,LGS013) including foul and surface water sewers and water mains. 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.	2/1/2017 12:19 PM
27	I understand people need homes to live in but on such a huge scale in the rural countryside? Peterborough,s Objectively Assessed Need for housing , does it need 2500 houses in a rural area?	1/30/2017 5:52 PM
28	Agree with plan	1/30/2017 12:40 PM
29	support	1/29/2017 2:20 PM
30	I support this plan	1/29/2017 2:18 PM
31	Fully agree	1/29/2017 1:05 PM
32	Yes	1/24/2017 9:33 PM
33	Agricultural land is wasted and too many house are planned to be built.	1/23/2017 10:20 PM
34	I fully support policies ALU1, ALU2, ALU3 and ALU4.	1/18/2017 10:56 AM
35	I strongly support policies ALU1, ALU2, ALU3 and ALU4.	1/18/2017 10:40 AM
36	I am in agreement with the policy	1/17/2017 2:05 PM
37	I strongly support the policy	1/17/2017 1:59 PM
38	ALU 1, 2 & 3. The proposed controls over the impact on the need to create green corridors and maximize the preservation of green spaces have my full support.	1/15/2017 5:36 PM
39	I fully support this policy	1/14/2017 10:08 PM
40	Wholeheartedly support this area	1/14/2017 12:22 PM
41	I agree with the proposed NP	1/14/2017 12:19 PM

42	agree	1/3/2017 8:44 PM
43	Totally support plan	1/3/2017 8:38 PM

Q13 What other comments do you wish to make on this Neighbourhood Plan?

Answered: 40 Skipped: 57

#	Responses	Date
1	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Further to our response to the SEA Screening Report in relation to Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan, in our letter dated 20 October 2016 (ref. 196585), we have the following comments to make. Natural England welcomes the strong commitment in the Plan policies to the protection and enhancement of the landscape, nature conservation and local green open spaces. We advise that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests are concerned (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) are concerned, that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan. Natural England welcomes that the Parish Council will work with Nene Park Trust, The Langdyke Trust and The Friends of Castor Hanglands and Ailsworth Heath (FOCHA) to ensure that the wildlife and countryside of the parish are protected. We hope you will find these comments helpful. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Janet Nuttall on 020 802 65894. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</p>	2/28/2017 12:11 PM
2	<p>This submission is intended to act as a formal comment on the draft Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2037. It is sent on behalf of Milton (Peterborough) Estates Company (hereafter referred to as Milton) which owns a significant area of farmland and woodland in Ailsworth parish as well as residential and commercial property in the village. Milton also provides employment for local inhabitants. Milton is wholly supportive of a Neighbourhood Plan being prepared on behalf of the parish and the general principles expressed within the pre-submission consultation draft. There is a strong historical connection between Milton Hall, Milton Park and its wider Estate. Milton is keen that this historical association is recognised and cherished.</p>	2/28/2017 12:06 PM
3	<p>representations submitted on behalf of our client, the Homes and Communities Agency ('HCA'), landowner of Great Kyne (land north of Castor and Ailsworth - Draft Local Plan policy reference LP35). The boundary of the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Area (designated 7th October 2014) covers a large tract of land, including part of the HCA's landholding (see Appendix 1). The HCA welcome the positive vision and objectives within the draft neighbourhood plan, which complement the draft Peterborough City Council ('PCC') Local Plan and emerging strategic policies contained therein. The below comments concern matters of detailed policy wording and application and should not be interpreted as an objection against the neighbourhood plan as a whole. The HCA are supportive of the emerging neighbourhood plans for Castor and Ailsworth and it is clear a great deal of time and effort has gone into their production. The HCA would welcome the opportunity to work with both groups moving forward as the plans are refined leading up to submission. The next iteration of the plan should reference the draft Local Plan's strategic allocation of Great Kyne and proposed Country Park. The HCA would also request that the plan disaggregates and/or makes explicit those policies which apply to the village and those which apply to all new development within the neighbourhood area (including Great Kyne). Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss these representations in greater detail.</p>	2/28/2017 11:49 AM
4	<p>Castor Parish Council is in complete support of the proposals in this consultation.</p>	2/17/2017 7:16 PM
5	<p>Introduction 1.1 Peterborough City Council (PCC) was consulted on the pre-submission draft of the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan (ANP) during the formal 6 week Regulation 14 consultation between 3 January and 17 February 2017. 1.2 PCC has provided assistance to the group producing the ANP since the neighbourhood area was designated in September 2014. PCC would like to congratulate the neighbourhood planning group on reaching this milestone, and for all of the effort that has gone into producing the plan and the evidence that underpins it. Purpose of this Report 1.3 The comments in this report are intended to assist the group in making the final changes necessary to the plan in advance of submitting it to PCC. These comments are intended to: ↗ enhance the deliverability of the plan; ↗ assist in making it clear for all readers; ↗ help ensure the policies make it through examination without amendment; and ↗ assist in a successful referendum. It also offers a view on whether the plan and its policies meet the Basic Conditions in accordance with statutory requirements in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as introduced through the Localism Act 2011. The Basic Conditions are that the plan: ↗ has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; ↗ contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; ↗ is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority; ↗ does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations; and ↗ satisfies any other prescribed conditions are met and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the plan. It should be noted that the development plan for Peterborough currently consists of the Local Plan (which consists of the Core Strategy DPD adopted 2011, the Site Allocations DPD adopted 2012, the Planning Policies DPD adopted 2012, and the City Centre DPD adopted December 2015), the Minerals and Waste Core</p>	2/17/2017 11:07 AM

Strategy adopted 2011, and the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD adopted in 2012. However, it should also be noted that PCC is currently producing a new Local Plan to replace the adopted Local Plan. This new Local Plan is currently anticipated to be adopted in May 2018 and so it would be prudent for the policies of this emerging plan to be taken into account in your plan to avoid any possible future conflict. The policies of the ANP have been reviewed against both the adopted and emerging Local Plans as well as against any relevant parts of the Minerals and Waste Plan.

1.4 Please note that the comments below do not identify spelling and grammar issues, of which some were found during the review. After revising the neighbourhood plan in light of comments received during the regulation 14 pre-submission consultation, the neighbourhood planning group should do a thorough read through of the ANP before submitting it to PCC to ensure that spelling and grammatical errors are addressed.

1.5 As part of the submission of the plan, the neighbourhood planning group will need to produce a Consultation Statement and a Basic Conditions Statements, along with fulfilling other requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (as amended). It is recommended that these 2 two documents are sent to PCC prior to submission for a quality check to ensure that they satisfy the regulations and that they will be accessible and usable for the examiner.

Conclusion 1.6 The ANP is well presented and user-friendly, with good use of photographs and illustrations, and it is generally fit for purpose as a planning policy document, although the wording of and approach to some of the policies would benefit from revision.

1.7 Overall, it is considered that the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan, subject to the below comments and recommendations, meets the basic conditions as required by regulations. It is recommended that the following comments are taken on board prior to submitting the plan to PCC.

Section / Policy Comments General ↗
The approach of only including the planning-related matters in the neighbourhood plan and pursuing non-planning matters through a separate Community Action Plan is supported as this avoids any potential confusion about what is or is not part of the neighbourhood plan.

Paragraph 1.7 ↗ The wording of this paragraph should be amended slightly in order to be more accurate and to ensure it accounts for the future replacement of the NPPF and Local Plan. It is recommended that this is amended to read: "However, all neighbourhood plans must be in line with higher level planning policy, namely the National Planning Policy Framework and the Peterborough Local Plan. The overall requirement is that a Neighbourhood Plan has a presumption in favour of sustainable development."

2.1 Location and History of the Parish ↗
This information is interesting and it provides a useful context.

2.2 How this Neighbourhood Plan was Prepared ↗
As a reminder, your plan will need to be accompanied with a consultation statement at submission which will include full details of the consultation undertaken. As such, the details do not need to be repeated here, but you can retain them if you want.

3. Vision ↗
The contents of the vision is broadly supported.

4. Objectives ↗
The objectives are broadly supported as being suitable for Ailsworth.

5. Strategy ↗
The strategy section seems to include some elements of strategy with some information relating to wider planning policy context. Would it be clearer for the reader if this section was entitled 'Strategy and Planning Policy Context' and if the subsections were more defined?

Paragraph 5.5 ↗ The Peterborough Local Plan is not at regional level, it is recommended that this heading is renamed 'District'.

6. Policies ↗
The paragraph formatting differs in this section against other sections (here it starts 6.01 whereas in other sections it was 5.1, for example). It is noted that throughout the rest of this section a different paragraph structure is used to account for the subsections, but it would be sensible to review all the paragraph numbering to ensure that it is applied consistently throughout.

↗ In the community feedback paragraphs in each subsection of the policies section, there is a section on the consultation that has taken place. This is 3 Section / Policy Comments helpful for the Reg 14 stage but not necessary for your next version of the plan as the consultation process has been set out elsewhere in the plan, and in the forthcoming Consultation Statement. It is recommended, therefore, that these sections be deleted or significantly streamlined to remove unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 6.01 ↗ The wording of the second sentence in this paragraph needs to be amended slightly to more accurately reflect the application of the plan: "Applicants and decision makers should consider all relevant policies in this plan as well as those in the latest adopted Local Plan when developing and deciding upon proposals."

Paragraph 6.02 ↗ This paragraph seems to largely replicate the wording in the vision and objectives and its repetition is not necessary in this location. Also the statement in the paragraph following the bulleted list is not necessary to include. To avoid confusion, it is suggested this para be deleted.

Paragraph 6.03-6.05 ↗ These paragraphs provide a useful explanation of the layout of the section to help readers to understand and navigate.

Policy Area 1 – Housing and the Built Environment ↗ It is acknowledged that the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan (and, of course, the complementary Castor one) is being done to a similar timetable to the preparation of a new Peterborough Local Plan. Whilst uncertain at this stage, it may well be that the Neighbourhood Plan is 'adopted' slightly before the wider Local Plan. Inevitably, this parallel process has the potential for conflict in policy formulation and confusion for the reader.

↗ Whilst acknowledging the above challenge, it is considered that this section should be more forthcoming about the fact that, in the recent Further Draft consultation, the new Local Plan included land to the north of the A47 as a proposed strategic allocation and that, if included in the final Local Plan, it would deliver significant growth within the parish. Entirely avoiding any mention of this proposal in your Neighbourhood Plan is not helpful to the reader. It is an important piece of context and residents may think it strange that there is no reference. PCC can work with you on what might be suitable wording for your Neighbourhood Plan.

↗ Notwithstanding the above, it is essential to be made clear that the policies in this section relating to the amount of growth only apply to the village area and not the parish area.

Paragraph 6.1.1.3 ↗ It is not clear what a 'layer of growth is', this wording should be reviewed. For example: "It is important that future growth creates high quality development that contributes to the character of the village and provides local benefit."

Paragraph 6.1.1.4 ↗ As the neighbourhood plan proposes only small sites to come forward of 10 or fewer homes, but the Local Plan (both existing and emerging) only seeks affordable housing contributions from sites of 15 or more dwellings, it is very unlikely that any affordable housing will be delivered as suggested in this paragraph. This wording should be amended

	to remove reference to affordable housing if the cap on dwelling numbers is retained. 6.1.2 Community Feedback It is recommended that a paragraph number should be added to the first paragraph for consistency. 6.1.3 Supporting Plans and Policies It is recommended that paragraph numbering should be added for consistency	
6	The plan is positive and, overall, does not portray Ailsworth as a community which is looking in on itself. It is important that we see ourselves as part of the City of Peterborough, contributing to and benefiting from the wider area.	2/17/2017 10:34 AM
7	Dear Jenny Draft Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan Thank you for referring the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Ailsworth, which was received on 09 January 2017. As the plan is required to be in general conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework and Peterborough Local Plan, we do not consider that we are able to provide you with further advice at this stage until we are consulted on individual planning applications by Peterborough City Council. However, we offer the following comments which may be of use: Groundwater and Contaminated Land The very far north-western corner of the Parish (north of Ailsworth Heath) is underlain by the Source Protection Zone 3 for the Elton public water supply abstraction approximately 3.5km north-east of the Parish boundary. This area is therefore vulnerable to pollution from certain types of development. Two historic landfill sites (Ailsworth Road and Ben Johnsons Pit) are located approximately 0.5 km to the north of the Parish Boundary. In 2001, Peterborough City Council determined these sites as Contaminated Land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The landfill sites were subsequently determined as a Special Site under Part 2A, as a result of the significant groundwater contamination impacting the Lincolnshire Limestone and Public Water Supply abstraction at Elton. The contaminant plumes from these landfill sites are not currently known to be impacting groundwater quality below the Parish. However, this information has been provided for awareness and consideration for any proposed future groundwater abstractions, particularly in the far northern parts of the Parish. Further information be provided by the Environment Agency on request. Preliminary Opinion We are able to provide a free preliminary opinion to a developer/applicant per site. This will outline our position and highlights any key environmental risks that we are concerned about as a statutory consultee and provide developers with an idea of what we would expect to receive within a planning application. Charged Service for Planning Advice If further bespoke advice is required outside of a formal planning application then this will form part of our charged for planning advice service. Please note that this response is based on the information provided at this time and if this changes in the future we would need to consider our position again. We trust that the above information is of assistance. If you would like to discuss our response further, or would like more information about our charged for planning advice service, please do not hesitate to contact me.	2/17/2017 10:06 AM
8	I fully support the contents of your Parish Neighbourhood Plan. (Sorry i sent previous one by mistake)	2/16/2017 5:32 PM
9	I think it is a very well laid out and well argued development plan. My big concern is who would control the small increase in dwellings and who would control the number of dwellings on the brown field sites and ensure the provision of appropriate parking etc. Where money is involved there is a tendency to maximise profit at the expense of rational and sensible development. This must be resisted. People in area of influence change and this can change the course of the plan how can this be resisted.	2/15/2017 4:10 PM
10	I support the ideas on the policies	2/15/2017 3:38 PM
11	have been consulted well on the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan and am in agreement with it.	2/15/2017 11:46 AM
12	I am in favour of the neighbourhood plan and see it as a great opportunity to emphasise to Peterborough Council that we want sensitive and careful development of our rural environment here in Ailsworth making sure that local heritage and wildlife are protected. It is a shining example of how people given their 'head' can produce a vision of the future of our village without damaging the natural world and our local heritage. Whereas the Peterborough Local Plan, with its recommendation of 2,500 houses north of A47, shows no consideration or sensitivity to preserving our local fragile landscape, heritage and wildlife biodiversity.	2/14/2017 4:16 PM
13	Overall I think this is a very good plan and is a credit to all who have worked on it. Well done ! I know there are many detailed proposals that have been put forward that have not been included in the NP. I realize that much of that is due to the limitations of the NP process. Hopefully those ideas will go into the Community Action Plan .It is important that we carry on with that and it does not get forgotten, because many of those issues would greatly improve our communities , irrespective of major planning decisions about new developments and also because we may need some concrete proposals when we negotiate with the planning authorities and potential developers.. .	2/14/2017 1:03 PM
14	I think this is a robust and sensible plan, respecting the village look and feel.	2/13/2017 3:24 PM
15	As a villager I have been very involved with and consulted upon all stages of this plan. The policies proposed are sound and allow for reasonable growth within our village and our conjoined village Castor, over time. They show a real understanding of the local environmental, scientific, historical and cultural issues which have shaped our villages without ignoring the national imperative for more housing. There is a commitment to developing creative, characterful and interesting buildings which reflect and add to the local surroundings. There is a further commitment to supporting the livelihoods of local residents and to supporting some development of small businesses. There is also a commitment to continue to consult residents on developments and to learn from past experiences. I support this plan in its entirety. I do not support the PCCs Draft Local Plan which would destroy our countryside and our villages and turn us into another 'new township'	2/13/2017 2:04 PM

16	I wish to show my support for the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan. I agree with the vision, objectives and the policies to enable Ailsworth to remain a rural village which cares and provides for its residents and the surrounding countryside	2/13/2017 12:28 PM
17	This draft NP meets all the requirements of our Village. I have no hesitation in commending this plan to PCC for acceptance	2/12/2017 9:20 PM
18	As a long term resident and lover of nature, the Peterborough city council plan will deal tremendous damage to both the village and it's surrounding area. Historical and natural value in the proposed areas is undeniable!	2/12/2017 5:21 PM
19	I agree with the plans vision and support the neighbourhood plan	2/12/2017 5:07 PM
20	I support the content of the Ailsworth Neighbourhood plan	2/12/2017 9:52 AM
21	I heartily agree with the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan	2/9/2017 11:29 PM
22	I completely support the NP for Ailsworth Parish with an attractive village envelope in a rural parish setting with free access for residents and visitors north to open land towards Castor Hanglands and south into the Nene Valley.	2/8/2017 8:33 AM
23	Firstly to acknowledge the huge amount of work on our behalf by the team. Thank you. I particularly wish to reinforce my support for retaining the rural aspect of the village in the parish setting and preserving the historical and ecological sites.	2/6/2017 9:00 PM
24	Ailsworth is one of the characterful small (not a medium sized village as defined by the Peterborough Local plan) villages to be conserved as such with minimal growth. Any expansion of Castor or Ailsworth will be detrimental to the social cohesion and spirit of the village. This is an historic area going back centuries, part of the Nene Valley landscape to be retained for posterity.	2/1/2017 12:50 PM
25	There are a lot of heavy lorries using Helpston Road and there should be a weight and speed restriction on this road. The tight bends on this road are totally unsuitable for this sort of traffic.	1/30/2017 12:42 PM
26	The government has clearly stated a policy of preserving green field sites and rural villages from developments and to use brown field sites. There is more than adequate, brown field sites on LBC land on the edge of Peterborough to cater for development instead of proposed plans for Castor and Ailsworth	1/29/2017 1:10 PM
27	More emphasis should be given to 'The Maffit' this was an ancient gateway to Ailsworth in 'years gone by' and shouldn't be lost. - It needs to be protected as Clay/Cow Lane had been in Castor. The "Maffit"/"Moffit" means something similar to entry/exit via "The Long Field"	1/29/2017 1:03 PM
28	I agree with the majority of the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan but have concerns about Helpston Rd as follows: It is already used by large HGVs daily. It is narrow and hard for them navigate and several residents cars have been damaged. Cars regularly exceed the speed limit. It puts pedestrians at risk especially where it narrows. It isn regularly used by horses and cycles. Additional housing will impact further on this road in future.	1/25/2017 8:32 PM
29	As I live on Helpston Road I already have concerns about the current usage and traffic there. Large heavy goods vehicles use the road daily and have extreme trouble accessing the narrow parts of the road. Here there are no pavements and no room to add them. Residents cars are frequently damaged, pedestrians are also endangered especially by cars which grossly exceed the speed limit. Additional housing will impact negatively on this already busy road. I agree to the majority of the Ailsworth neighbourhood plan.	1/25/2017 8:24 PM
30	Dear Ms J Rice AILSWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN The Sutton Parish Councillors would like to confirm that they unanimously support the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan and also congratulate everyone involved on their sustained hard work and commitment in producing such an excellent Neighbourhood Plan. Best Wishes. Yours sincerely Deirdre McCumiskey Clerk Sutton Parish Council	1/24/2017 6:58 AM
31	We find the policies clearly defined and well presented	1/23/2017 12:14 PM
32	I am in full support of the policies set out here for the long-term future of the village and of the whole parish.	1/23/2017 9:26 AM
33	Whilst I know this is not a planning matter, occasional heavy lorries and agricultural machinery on Helpston Road can be worrying especially at certain narrow points of the road; some form of traffic calming maybe appropriate.	1/18/2017 11:03 AM
34	I am in agreement with the Neighbourhood Plan	1/17/2017 2:06 PM
35	I strongly support the Neighbourhood Plan	1/17/2017 2:01 PM
36	This NP has been an excellent exercise resulting in a very good plan which has my total support.	1/15/2017 5:50 PM

37	I am articularely concerned about traffic on Helpston Road especially in the light of possible future development. The road is narrow, and verges for pedestrians is intermittent. The road is used by traffic pasing through the village onto Peterborough Road, often travelling too fast, and there has been an increase of large heavy vehicles which have damaged at least one property where the road narrows and there are parked vehicles due to no off street parking for residents. This road poses a great threat to pedetriand, children and elderly people especially at the bottom where there is a narrow blind corner. There is concern about a possible increase in traffic, both in the short term during any future developppment, and in the long term with any future expansion. There should be an urgent investigation into possible traffic calming installations both now and in the future - many of us feel there is a tragedy just waiting to happen and appeals to the Parish Council have not been successful	1/15/2017 12:10 PM
38	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan	1/14/2017 10:11 PM
39	Support all in NP	1/14/2017 12:25 PM
40	Thank you for including us within your Regulation 14 Consultation. As the area does not border onto Leicester shire and it is quite a distance away we do not foresee any impact of the proposals on Leicestershire and therefore make no comments at this time	1/10/2017 8:21 AM