



# Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

***2014 Evidence Base***

***2015 Reg 14 Consultation***

***2015 Reg 15 Responses***

# Evidence Is All



2

- Evidence is at the very heart of a Neighbourhood Plan.
- It is not enough to simply make statements or draft Policies.
- Before your NP gets anywhere near an Inspector it needs to satisfy your District Council – they are the body responsible for submission.
- They will expect to see evidence to support your all proposals. They will not submit without it.

# Evidence Is Wide Ranging



3

- Evidence of Meetings.
- Evidence of Processes by which you arrived at conclusions and Policies.
- Evidence of sources for any statistics used.
- Evidence of all Consultations, feedback from those Consultations and responses to that feedback...at every stage.
- Evidence to show that Policies have the support of residents.

## ... How Important Is It ?



4

- Your Evidence Base is at least as important as your Plan Document.
- It will, almost certainly, be bigger than your Plan Document.
- It needs to be clearly laid-out and referenced to the relevant Plan Policies.
- Get the idea ?



# 2014 Residents Responses

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan - Draft				
Feedback From Public Consultation - June & July 2014				Approval Rating %
Agree with Plan Vision	YES 133	NO 5		95.0
Agree with Environmental Policies	YES 138	NO 1		98.6
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
	E1 3	E2 1	E3 1	
Agree with Development Policies on Traffic	YES 128	NO 12		91.4
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
	D1 7	D2 5	D3 5	
Agree with Development Policies on Drainage	YES 133	NO 3		95.0
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
	D4 2	D5 5	D6 6	
Agree with Development Design Policy	YES 132	NO 7		94.3
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
	D7 3	D8 6	D9 4	D10 6
Agree with Development Housing Policies	YES 124	NO 14		88.6
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
	H1 16	H2 3	H3 3	H4 7 H5 6
Agree with Business Policy	YES 137	NO 3		97.9
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
		B1 3		
Agree with Community Facilities Policy	YES 135	NO 5		96.4
If NO - Which Policies are disagreed with ? If indicated				
		C1 6		

Written comments are logged on separate sheet(s)

NNPSC/JHS  
4/8/14  
Page1of2

This feedback, from residents, confirmed we were on the right track and demonstrates the level of support we had from our public.

# Reg 15 Residents Response Log – Blank & Complete



## Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

### Regulation 15 Responses From Residents

#### Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

Consultee Name :

Ref Policy Number :

Consultee Comments :

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments :

Plan Modified : YES NO

----- < -----

Ref Policy Number :

Consultee Comments :

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments :

Plan Modified : YES NO

----- < -----

## Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

### Regulation 15 Responses From Residents

#### Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

Response Reference : RES009

Ref Policy Number or Area: E2/3/4/5. D1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8. H1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8/9. B1.

Resident Comments : Agree with Plan narrative as a whole and Policies as shown above. See comments below.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- < -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: E1

Resident Comments : Understand that land owned by brewery behind Brown Cow PH, on A46, is to be sold with a view to development.

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted

NNPSC Supporting Comments : No formal communications received at this time.

Plan Modified : NO

----- < -----

# Reg 15 Residents Response Log – Summary



Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan		
Regulation 15 Responses from Residents		
Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)		
On Behalf of Nettleham Parish Council		
Summary of Written Responses to		
from Regulation 14 Consultation 22 Dec 2014 to 31 Jan 2015		
Note	Number	%
i Number of written responses received from Residents *	41	
ii Total Number supporting Draft Plan	40	97.6
iii Total Number supporting Draft Plan without reservation	22	53.7
iv Number supporting Draft Plan with minor reservations	15	36.6
v Number supporting Draft Plan with significant reservations	3	7.3
vi Number not supporting Draft Plan	1	2.4
Notes Explained		
i	* 2 responses received but ES042 is a duplicate of ES013, so is counted.	
ii	Sum of rows iii + v + vi	
iii	Support Draft Plan without any reservations.	
iv	Support Draft Plan but with single, minor, concern, e.g. route to footpath.	
v	Generally support Draft Plan but with more than one concern, e.g. minor or more significant nature, e.g. effects on traffic or additional housing.	
vi	Generally not supportive of the Draft Plan.	
Consultation		
The statutory 6 week Regulation 14 Consultation ran from 22 December 2014 to 31 January 2015, inclusive. The extra time allowing for residents who may have been away over the Christmas and New Year periods. Notification of this consultation were hand-delivered to each dwelling in the village. This notification included details of two open days, organised by NNPSC, to allow residents to ask questions of the NNPSC, discuss any concerns and make their comments known. The open days were held on 13 & 14 January 2015 and, over the two days, welcomed 15 visitors. The written responses received as a result of the above consultation period are those logged in this section.		
Concerns & Requests Voiced by Residents.		
	Score	
Request for more bridleways	6	
Location of footpaths.	5	
Parking & Traffic Related	5	
Loss of wider benefits, (incl. Care Home?), of small sites & large site	4	
Concern flooding caused by new developments	3	
Against moving Scout hut from village centre.	2	
Against more commercial development/retention of such sites.	2	
Concern phased development will increase train & highways.	2	
Site to be better accessed via Sudbrook Lane rather than the Hawthorns.	2	
Concern low-density developments reduce financial yield benefit to village.	1	
Against development behind Brown Cow "PH."	1	
Do not support Beal Homes proposal for extended site C	1	
Concerns site A will have detrimental visual impact on area.	1	
Concerns site A will have detrimental impact on village businesses.	1	
Hope developments can be staggered, as outlined.	1	
How to ensure developers' promises, (allotments etc), are delivered over time.	1	
How to ensure developers create new footpaths.	1	
Why mention the provision of a library in the NP?	1	
SUDS should be extended to house extensions and new infill builds.	1	
Need to include desirability of new Baker's Green grocer in village.	1	
Need to ensure current commercial sites are retained as such.	1	
Policy required to address issue of CVs.	1	
Site C joins area which already has more than its share of development.	1	

Similar Response Logs are also used for inputs from Statutory Consultees and other Professional Bodies.

The important thing is to log these responses and address – and log - any concerns expressed or objections raised.

Did I mention that  
“Evidence Is Vital”?