

Regulation 14 Public Consultation Comments in full

		Relevant to:	
		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
GENERAL			
Q1 - Are you satisfied with the timely progress of the Neighbourhood Plan?			
C101	I trust those concerned will ensure this happens	YES	NO
C102	We do need to get the plan adopted asap.	YES	NO
C103	Extremely comprehensive	YES	NO
C104	We need more car parking space	YES	NO
C105	It does seem to take a long time to prepare! But will be good when it's done!	YES	NO
C106	No other questions answered.	YES	NO
C107	Certain aspects such as transport / roads could progress quicker	YES	NO
C108	It possibly should have been completed earlier.	YES	NO
C109	If the plan had been completed earlier, would we have had so many issues with the Gladman development?	YES	NO
C110	No other questions answered.	YES	NO
C111	No, stop it	YES	NO
C112	I hope every household in Stanwick completes this form in order for it to be of value.	YES	NO
C113	ASAP please!	YES	NO
C114	Having read through the embryonic proposals there appear to be many 'concepts' which are still at the planning stage, most of all infrastructure issues.	YES	NO
C115	Seems to have been forever to get to this stage	YES	NO
GENERAL			
Q2 - Are you satisfied with the content of the Neighbourhood Plan?			
C116	Concerned that no mention of increase of public services ie GPs, expansion of school if housing increases	YES	NO
C117	How can any plan be omissions free.	YES	NO
C118	I do not know enough about the planning processes to be able to comment with certainty on the content.	YES	NO
C119	Appreciate the amount of work	YES	NO
C120	Appreciate the amount of work	YES	NO
C121	This is a tautological argument.	YES	NO
C122	There appears to be a lot still to do. For instance, there are real traffic issues today but no suggested resolution in the plan (i.e. double yellow lines, etc.).	YES	NO
C123	No, stop it	YES	NO
C124	There is no mention of need to dual A45 to reduce traffic in Stanwick or Spencer Parade widening.	YES	NO
C125	As well as a playgroup and a children's nursery, there is also a Registered Childminder - Hollie's Childcare.	YES	NO
C126	Can commercial development in Stanwick be considered here? - Wind turbines? MRFs etc? Or is this dealt with elsewhere?	YES	YES
C127	No reference to dark skies - already being damaged by Raunds warehouse lighting. Stanwick development should consider dark skies.	YES	YES

GENERAL		Relevant to:	
Q3 - Are you satisfied with the consultation with residents?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C128	We have had the chance to comment throughout the process.	YES	NO
C129	Whilst satisfied with consultation process, we need to ensure more residents take part in the consultation than the previous one	YES	NO
C130	Village evenings to promote plans and update are welcome.	YES	NO
C131	Didn't know anything about it & would have liked to be more involved	YES	NO
C132	No. Because our views are ignored.	YES	NO
C133	Informed.	YES	NO
C134	Hopefully there will be many more involved this time	YES	NO
C135	Offered assistance, was ignored.	YES	NO
C136	Concise & well laid out document	YES	NO
C137	There has not been enough presentations or village meetings to full[y] understand these issues. One presentation was not good enough.	YES	NO
C138	You can ensure all residents are aware & involved, but that doesn't guarantee that they will respond.	YES	NO
C139	In Plain English. Not legal terms.	YES	NO
C140	People are not able to get involved because of a lack of knowledge regarding the outcome of the final result. In short, too complicated for the layman.	YES	NO
C141	Advertising good, opportunities for communication at Village Showcase, etc. Needs to be a way of reaching out to those who do not get involved or show interest.	YES	NO
C142	I have not been aware of anything until this came through my door. I work 7:15 am - 7 pm and had not seen anything advertised.	YES	NO
GENERAL			
Q4 - Are you satisfied with the available publicity regarding the Neighbourhood Plan?			
C143	Not enough information by you. It would have been better to go through each issue separately at meetings to fully understand their implications.	YES	NO
C144	This is the first I had heard about plans. Most welcome.	YES	NO
C145	Well publicised this time	YES	NO
C146	Though more could be done to increase awareness of the plan and stages of its development.	YES	NO
C147	Need more info, more often	YES	NO
C148	Visited Village Hall when on show	YES	NO
C149	But more could be done - mostly aware of this because of Facebook and if I wasn't on there, and hadn't received this I don't know if I would have known about this.	YES	NO
C150	Fairly	YES	NO
C151	Not totally satisfied. More publicity would be beneficial.	YES	NO
C152	Residents I come into contact with are aware of the plan	YES	NO
C153	Much more publicity on display for this final consultation	YES	NO
C154	More info always welcome - FACEBOOK PAGE / WEBSITE?	YES	NO
C155	No. Don't do online..	YES	NO
C156	More publicity required	YES	NO

GENERAL		Relevant to:	
Q5 - Are you satisfied that we can proceed with the Neighbourhood Plan?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C157	Please continue.	YES	NO
C158	Good luck with trying to reach objectives with "Planning" trying to achieve different ideals.	YES	NO
C159	Action needs to happen	YES	NO
C160	Still no safe crossing point between village and the increasingly popular Stanwick Lakes.	YES	NO
C161	Some areas of plan seem to be contradictory. You want to develop village and control traffic. How? We cannot have both effectively.	YES	NO
C162	If the plan does not include any more development.	YES	NO
C163	Suggest amendments as suggested in following sections.	YES	NO
C164	Concerned it will be overridden in the interests of developers rather than residents	YES	NO
C165	Good luck with trying to reach objectives with "Planning" trying to achieve different ideals.	YES	NO
C166	No, stop it	YES	NO
HOUSING			
Q6 - Are you satisfied with Housing Objective 1: "To ensure Stanwick develops in a sustainable manner, where any new housing is in response to a proven housing shortage and that the housing is provided in a range of tenures, types and sizes so that local people of all ages can continue to live here"?			
C167	Concerned that no mention of increase of public services ie GPs, expansion of school if housing increases	YES	NO
C168	Needs to take more account of infrastructure before development proceeds, ie school places - doctors surgery - traffic calming throughout the village main routes	YES	NO
C169	Not 100%	YES	NO
C170	I have no objections to houses being built on brownfield sites but not within the village centre which is becoming really congested	YES	NO
C171	I think Stanwick should be left as it is.	YES	NO
C172	Totally agree	YES	NO
C173	Affordable housing / council housing needs to be present as well as "Millionaire Close".	YES	NO
C174	After reading Objective 1, we feel safer in the knowledge that no huge housing developments will 'spring up' and jeopardise the ruralness of Stanwick	YES	NO
C175	Worth expressing growth proposals in terms of % of current population.	YES	YES
C176	But only if the rest of the plan is also kept to, Stanwick will not cope as a village with more houses & the same amount of services.	YES	NO
C177	East Northants & powers above that need to understand this.	YES	NO
C178	I do not see how much more development can be achieved effectively. There is enough congestion in the village now, especially around PO.	YES	NO
C179	Not only 1st time buyers but retired persons as well	YES	NO
C180	We do not want any affordable housing even if there is a demonstrable need. There is enough scope in other urban areas (Raunds, Higham, etc.). As mentioned, I am glad no development sites are suggested.	YES	NO
C181	No more houses	YES	NO
C182	If Stanwick develops any more we will not be a village sadly.	YES	NO
C183	There is no proven housing shortage as the plan states.	YES	NO

C184	Very important it is sustainable.	YES	NO
C185	After reading Objective 1, we feel safer in the knowledge that no huge housing developments will 'spring up' and jeopardise the ruralness of Stanwick	YES	NO
C186	Regarding environment & sustainable issues it would be nice if any developments had to achieve better / higher than one basic required housing regs at the time - to attempt to 'future proof' developments.	YES	NO
C187	Definitely - we neither want nor need any more housing developments in Stanwick	YES	NO
C188	I have no objections to houses being built on brownfield sites but not within the village centre which is becoming really congested	YES	NO
C189	This requires very careful monitoring	YES	NO
C190	Too big a 'village' already. Roads in & out of 'village' not coping, school not coping	YES	NO
C191	The key word being sustainable.	YES	NO
HOUSING		Relevant to:	
Q7 - Are you satisfied with the Housing Policy HSG1?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C192	There might be proven need but if Stanwick is to retain a rural village this will have to precede any other objective. We are only so big. There comes a point when enough is enough.	YES	NO
C193	Worried about the situation of more vehicles in Stanwick	YES	NO
C194	As the largest village in the county we DO NOT NEED further development.	YES	NO
C195	Doesn't need any more housing.	YES	NO
C196	Houses too big aimed at those earning above average. Smaller houses have no garden, too close together, limited choice if small budget.	YES	NO
C197	I accept that growth is inevitable. The location and design & impact on area must be priority, so I support this fully	YES	NO
C198	Provided Strategic Gap is retained.	YES	NO
C199	Would this mean that the potential development of 198 houses along West Street could still be approved one day?	YES	NO
C200	Yes, to meet proven need	YES	NO
C201	Very important that development meets proven need, especially if there is no current evidence of a shortfall.	YES	NO
C202	New houses should be in keeping with the village and geared more to first-time buyers and if possible infill instead of taking green fields	YES	NO
C203	No more development in Raunds or Stanwick. Enough is enough. How are the doctors or hospitals going to cope!!	YES	NO
C204	No more development	YES	NO
C205	Gladman's development does not contribute to the improvement of the village and should be opposed at every opportunity.	YES	NO
C206	But only if the rest of the plan is also kept to, Stanwick will not cope as a village with more houses & the same amount of services.	YES	NO
C207	There should be no development on rural sites	YES	NO
C208	What has been done to identify needs? With a rapidly ageing population there is a need for retirement / assisted living places or opportunities for downsizing. No proposals for young adults accommodation in shared housing / one bedroom flats for example.	YES	YES
C209	Further large development outside the current village boundary would destroy the fabric of the village and put more strain on local resources.	YES	NO
C210	Is affordable new-build property on any agenda for young first-time buyer and maybe relatives needing managed circumstances? ...	YES	NO
C211	The village cannot cope with more traffic. There is insufficient school places and medical facilities.	YES	NO
C212	Not 190 new homes on the edge of the village!	YES	NO
C213	Within a small radius I think the proven need would have been met already.	YES	NO
C214	Please make sure there are options for young families to buy a first property in the village	YES	NO

C215	Totally agree	YES	NO
C216	No more large new developments	YES	NO
C217	Prefer not to see any new developments.	YES	NO
C218	What has been done to identify needs? With a rapidly ageing population there is a need for retirement / assisted living places or opportunities for downsizing. No proposals for young adults accommodation in shared housing / one bedroom flats for example.	YES	YES
C219	There should be no development on rural sites	YES	NO
C220	No more large scale housing sites.	YES	NO
C221	Would this mean that the potential development of 198 houses along West Street could still be approved one day?	YES	NO
C222	Yes, we need to maintain our identity of a rural village.	YES	NO
C223	No large developments are needed in Stanwick due to large areas being developed in local towns	YES	NO
C224	Not large estates.	YES	NO
C225	No proven need.	YES	NO
C226	Doctors surgery, chemist, toilets	YES	NO
C227	New houses should be more in keeping with houses of character in the village - no more pillars on the front	YES	NO
C228	Does not address attitude to individual development, eg "granny extensions", which would enable multi-age-group housing.	YES	YES
C229	We do not want any affordable housing even if there is a demonstrable need. There is enough scope in other urban areas (Raunds, Higham, etc.). As mentioned, I am glad no development sites are suggested. We do not want any housing considered in our area.	YES	NO
HOUSING		Relevant to:	
Q8 - Are you satisfied with the Housing Policy HSG2?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C230	But only if the rest of the plan is also kept to, Stanwick will not cope as a village with more houses & the same amount of services.	YES	NO
C231	Fill in development is fine	YES	NO
C232	No attempt has been made to gather opinion on where such development within the village could take place. This may cause some friction but needs to be discussed.	YES	NO
C233	Not clear what a rural exception site actually is, this needs clarification in the document	YES	NO
C234	No exceptions should be allowed	YES	NO
C235	It is a travesty that our green and pleasant land is being ruined. Our quality of life is ruined by all the building going on around us. Shame on you ENDC.	YES	NO
C236	Provided we keep the structure of the village.	YES	NO
C237	What rural exception sites do we have without expanding into adjoining fields? And then we will no longer be a village. Orchard Farm site seems a better infill option to me. Now open space I can't use at all.	YES	NO
C238	Totally agree	YES	NO
C239	Not clear. Please put in simple English!	YES	NO
C240	Doesn't need any more housing.	YES	NO
C241	No more houses	YES	NO
C242	All housing on green field sites and open parkland should be resisted	YES	NO
C243	Provided Strategic Gap is retained.	YES	NO

C244	No attempt has been made to gather opinion on where such development within the village could take place. This may cause some friction but needs to be discussed.	YES	YES
C245	If identified as a real need, and maintains and is in keeping with village.	YES	NO
C246	The village cannot cope with more traffic. There is insufficient school places and medical facilities.	YES	NO
C247	A proven need could be open to interpretation	YES	NO
C248	Further large development outside the current village boundary would destroy the fabric of the village and put more strain on local resources.	YES	NO
C249	Being sensible about it.	YES	NO
C250	Not enough information disclosed on rural exception sites.	YES	NO
C251	Not acceptable to build on Green Belt, Paddocks, grass fields.	YES	NO
C252	Not in Stanwick.	YES	NO
C253	ENC must demonstrate robust policies. The provisos listed in HSG3 could also be used here.	YES	NO
C254	No	YES	NO
C255	No exceptions should be allowed	YES	NO
C256	There should be no exception on rural sites	YES	NO
C257	As the largest village in the county we DO NOT NEED further development.	YES	NO
C258	What is a rural exception site?	YES	NO
C259	Object strongly to the current planning application, namely Gladman Construction to build on land opposite Stanwick Hotel.	YES	NO
C260	If necessary - with careful monitoring.	YES	NO
C261	?	YES	NO
C262	But, as the village is nearly full to capacity, perhaps only small developers for local needs would be beneficial to the village community.	YES	NO
C263	Would this mean that the potential development of 198 houses along West Street could still be approved one day?	YES	NO
C264	No development at Orchard Farm	YES	NO
C265	Large housing development on green field site would change Stanwick to an unacceptable degree	YES	NO
C266	Keep our rural areas rural. Put the new housing in local towns - Raunds, Higham. Keep our village a small village.	YES	NO
C267	Would this mean that the potential development of 198 houses along West Street could still be approved one day?	YES	NO
HOUSING		Relevant to:	
Q9 - Are you satisfied with the Housing Policy HSG3?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C268	?	NO	NO
C269	We all require a little space!	YES	NO
C270	But is Gladman's proposal; a windfall site?	YES	NO
C271	Any new substantial residential development should be restricted to the west of the village facilitating immediate access onto A45 to prevent further exacerbation of the already chronic traffic congestion in the village.	YES	NO
C272	Recent East Street development should never have been approved as did not satisfy all of these criteria.	YES	NO
C273	Don't think HSG3 has been followed in the past so doubt it will be enforced in the future.	YES	NO
C274	Providing less than 5 houses	YES	NO
C275	Providing less than 5 houses	YES	NO
C276	As the largest village in the county we DO NOT NEED further development.	YES	NO

C277	Stanwick is big enough. Windfall builds will kill everything off in the village.	YES	NO
C278	I see no need here.	YES	NO
C279	Your proposed policy relating to windfall developments refers only to previously developed 'brownfield' land and not to other areas of land that might provide suitable land for modest residential developments. The National Planning Policy Framework excludes residential garden land from the definition of previously developed land. If the policy were to be adopted as currently drafted then there could be no residential development on any garden land regardless of the other benefits that the development might offer, such as possible enhancements to the street scene. The resource of garden land within the settlement boundary should not be discounted out of hand. There are examples of such sites in the village that have been developed successfully in the past and the sensitive development of residential garden land can provide homes for residents without expanding the boundary of the village. There may be other such sites that might come to light during the plan period and this potential resource should not be lost to the village. The NPPF does not say that dwellings should not be built on garden land, the inclusion of such a policy in the neighbourhood plan would therefore be in conflict with the NPPF.	YES	YES
C280	Small windfall developments (5-10 houses)	YES	NO
C281	Would this mean that the potential development of 198 houses along West Street could still be approved one day?	YES	NO
C282	Each case on its own merit only	YES	NO
C283	Provided we keep the structure of the village.	YES	NO
C284	It seems to me that Orchard Farm site meets all the requirements for HSG3, so why has it been designated as open space as a private[ly] owned open space that cannot be used by us.	YES	NO
C285	No more development unless amenities are provided first.	YES	NO
C286	Are these windfall developments going to fall out of the sky then	YES	NO
C287	Would this mean that the potential development of 198 houses along West Street could still be approved one day?	YES	NO
C288	Expectations of meeting the requirements in para.d are highly unlikely and would be at odds with planning requirements.	YES	NO
C289	Provided Strategic Gap is retained.	YES	NO
C290	Recent East Street development should never have been approved as did not satisfy all of these criteria.	YES	NO
C291	But only if the rest of the plan is also kept to, Stanwick will not cope as a village with more houses & the same amount of services.	YES	NO
C292	HSG3(d) Additional traffic by the very nature of residential sites, however small, will exist.	YES	NO
C293	Totally agree	YES	NO
C294	?	NO	NO
C295	Make them small	YES	NO
C296	This is fair enough so long as all criteria are met.	YES	NO
C297	Further large development outside the current village boundary would destroy the fabric of the village and put more strain on local resources.	YES	NO
C298	We have plenty of ? In the surrounding area.	YES	NO
C299	Expectations of meeting the requirements in para.d are highly unlikely and would be at odds with planning requirements.	YES	NO

HOUSING DESIGN		Relevant to:	
Q10 - Are you satisfied with the Housing Objective 2: "To ensure that any new housing is of high quality design that respects Stanwick's local distinctiveness and enhances the historic character and setting of the parish"?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C300	Character of village must be preserved.	YES	NO
C301	As the largest village in the county we DO NOT NEED further development.	YES	NO
C302	None needed	YES	NO
C303	I believe that Housing Design is sometimes too 'safe'.	YES	NO
C304	Again - Wonderful ideal. Good luck	YES	NO
C305	No more development	YES	NO
C306	See comment Q6 - also applies here (Regarding environment & sustainable issues it would be nice if any developments had to achieve better / higher than one basic required housing regs at the time - to attempt to 'future proof' developments.).	YES	NO
C307	Again - Wonderful ideal. Good luck	YES	NO
C308	But still needs to look like the others.	YES	NO
C309	Preferably no new development at all	YES	NO
C310	I hope these new housing don't materialise. I would not have a new build now. Ugly cramped greed for trying to cram in as much as possible.	YES	NO
C311	Do not repeat mistakes of the past. Poorly-designed homes which blot the village character.	YES	NO
C312	Stanwick doesn't need more houses.	YES	NO
C313	Houses too big aimed at those earning above average. Smaller houses have no garden, too close together, limited choice if small budget.	YES	NO
C314	A noble objective if enforced	YES	NO
C315	Difficult to achieve with new housing.	YES	NO
C316	Any new housing in the future should not be crammed in so as to get as many houses as possible. There should be ample space between houses.	YES	NO
C317	What does 'high quality design' mean?	YES	NO
HOUSING DESIGN			
Q11 - Are you satisfied with Housing Design Policy HDN1?			
C318	Only doctors and toilet & maybe another shop	YES	NO
C319	More use of stone please.	YES	NO
C320	A big must - developments have taken place within Brookside that are totally out of keeping	YES	NO
C321	A big must - developments have taken place within Brookside that are totally out of keeping	YES	NO
C322	Particularly E	YES	NO
C323	Due to many bad and unsuitable planning decisions in the past (50 years) there does not seem to be a format remaining where design can be enforced.	YES	NO
C324	?	NO	NO
C325	I fully agree	YES	NO
C326	I do not think any councils have principles or they would stand up for the residents wishes more.	YES	NO
C327	Waffle	NO	NO
C328	?	NO	NO

HOUSING DESIGN		Relevant to:	
Q12 - Are you satisfied with Housing Design Policy HDN2?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C329	Due to many bad and unsuitable planning decisions in the past (50 years) there does not seem to be a format remaining where design can be enforced.	YES	NO
C330	As the largest village in the county we DO NOT NEED further development.	YES	NO
C331	This is Stanwick - a lot of the village is quite ugly - a great place to live but not beautiful.	YES	NO
C332	Infill new build should be in keeping with neighbouring properties.	YES	NO
C333	The housing estate off Stanwick Road eg Adams Close, Lovell Way, etc., is not acceptable - where are the bungalows, affordable houses on that estate. It disgusts me to see this estate with no concern for the lower end budget. If you have a smaller budget your option seems to be a flat, terrace, no garden of good size, no adequate parking, clear division in Stanwick, Rich - Poor.	YES	YES
C334	Absolute must.	YES	NO
C335	Leave as is	YES	NO
C336	Waffle	YES	NO
C337	? (See above)	YES	NO
C338	Agree	YES	NO
C339	Not happening	YES	NO
C340	I do not think that any of the natural assets gets taken into account.	YES	NO
C341	Your policy HDN2 makes no reference to the valuable contribution that appropriate modern design and the use of modern building materials can make to the future of the village going into the 21st century. Instead it implies that design should mimic development from history.	YES	NO
C342	Totally.	YES	NO

TRANSPORT		Relevant to:	
Q13 - Are you satisfied with the Transport Objective 3: "To seek solutions to the parking congestion issues and to reduce traffic volume and speed"?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C343	Traffic calming measures within the village is an urgent priority	YES	NO
C344	It has taken me 10 minutes to get through Stanwick on one occasion, due to poor parking, where can you speed???	YES	NO
C345	Widen Spencer Parade to provide parking on both sides of street	YES	NO
C346	No speed bumps.	YES	NO
C347	Need more parking restrictions	YES	NO
C348	Bad along High Street - Spencer Parade	YES	NO
C349	But I cannot see anything positive being done to stop vehicles parking on pavements, over junctions, on double yellow lines & outside schools. To temper the speed of traffic calming measures are needed.	YES	NO
C350	Continues to be a problem speeding through main street (Spencer Parade). No one stops to let you through. Cars parked get hit. School runs cause congestion.	YES	NO
C351	â On-street parking. Speed bumps into village ++	YES	NO
C352	No need for speed bumps on Church Street or Spencer Parade as impossible to speed due to parked cars! Spencer Parade needs making wider by pushing wall back so cars can be parked and vehicles pass safely.	YES	NO
C353	The school should close the Church Street entrance which is dangerous - use Raunds Road maybe buy more land at the back to enable this.	YES	NO
C354	Must see progress	YES	NO
C355	Making Spencer Parade and the High Street one way. Improve junctions with Villa Lane. Make space opposite Potters a car park?	YES	NO
C356	Create parking bays opposite houses in Spencer Parade (take wall down and create bays). Double yellow on house side.	YES	NO
C357	Double yellow should be on either side of the road coming into Stanwick from A45. Parking bays should be provided on left for the houses on the right.	YES	NO
C358	"Mitigate impacts" - mitigation not to disadvantage existing residents. Particularly re: roundabouts prioritising new developments.	YES	NO
C359	Development elsewhere already affect traffic through the village. Infrastructure must be considered before development and not afterwards, ie must be proactive.	YES	NO
C360	The area is in desperate need for more off-road parking for those houses without. Are subsidies available to help with costs to residents sorting a space? Can the car wash park in their own land rather than on the road?	YES	NO
C361	Too many vehicles allowed to park, area between The Club and Post Office. Speed of vehicles very serious problem near The Church. How is a FIRE ENGINE supposed to deal with this problem? Not forgetting Ambulance & Police.	YES	NO
C362	A big must!	YES	NO
C363	Reduce speed to 20 mph on Spencer Parade - with speed ramps.	YES	NO
C364	I feel a pedestrian crossing with lights is needed opposite Old School entrance plus a bridge to get to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C365	Take action! Permanent speed camera!	YES	NO
C366	The solution to parking congestion - ie yellow lines - may be worse than the problem.	YES	NO
C367	Parking restrictions need to be extended & enforced to prevent congestion getting worse.	YES	NO
C368	There needs to be a solution for Church Street, traffic drives too fast and parking is a problem. Maybe a permit scheme?	YES	NO
C369	How is the policies going to be achieved.	YES	NO
C370	Speed bumps, permanent speed camera, priority right of way points - some suggestions!	YES	NO

C371	We need action today not tomorrow. Every day it is easy to cite instances where emergency vehicles could not gain access because of irresponsible and selfish parking.	YES	NO
C372	Reduce speed to 20 mph on Spencer Parade - with speed ramps.	YES	NO
C373	The area is in desperate need for more off-road parking for those houses without. Are subsidies available to help with costs to residents sorting a space? Can the car wash park in their own land rather than on the road?	YES	NO
C374	Double yellow lines should be considered in the High Street from the doorway of the Post Office / Shop extending in line to the end of the Working Men's Club opposite.	YES	NO
C375	It is obvious to anyone that parking in the village centre is abysmal, particularly at school times. But, unfortunately, there appears to be no solution, due to a lack of space.	YES	NO
C376	Stanwick is already suffering.	YES	NO
C377	"Thoroughfare" through West Street, Spencer Parade, & Raunds Road exceptionally restrictive. Please ignore - covered in Q16 Policy TRA2.	YES	NO
C378	Concerns over plans to reduce parking congestion - any scheme to alleviate parking will only result in displacing the vehicles elsewhere.	YES	NO
C379	Could do more	YES	NO
C380	Traffic lights on spencer parade	YES	NO
C381	These are no solutions. Only a gripe that more homes unacceptable!	YES	NO
C382	Congestion on Spencer Parade is bad. More parking spaces for residents off road.	YES	NO
C383	Speed of traffic through the village is an ongoing problem and needs to be addressed asap.	YES	NO
C384	This really needs to be addressed	YES	NO
C385	Slow down signs showing speed work.	YES	NO
C386	Providing they are realistic. Perceptions of congestion are exaggerated by some members of the community.	YES	NO
C387	Good luck trying to get parking on space that doesn't exist!	YES	NO
C388	This is essential to the village as current traffic throughfare is extremely dangerous.	YES	NO
C389	How is the policies going to be achieved.	YES	NO
C390	Specific measures? The plan mentions the congestion and parking, but I cannot see any specific proposals. The parking on pavements is appalling in the centre of the village and elsewhere. The blocking of pavements is illegal, but it continues daily. It is dangerous and the central area, Church Street, even on the junction of the hill by the corner of the Church, particularly during school starting / ending times.	YES	NO
C391	Is Spencer Parade a road or a car park? The highways are supposed to facilitate access, not impede it.	YES	NO
C392	Problems accessing West Street?	YES	NO
C393	A big must!	YES	NO
C394	Reduce traffic	YES	NO
C395	Parking congestion does slow down through traffic but is not a long-term answer	YES	NO
C396	Could I suggest at either approach to the village - road signs with "VILLAGE - ACCESS ONLY" be on display - I appreciate they cannot be enforced - however, on a number of times that, if I want to go into Raunds, I turn left at the bottom of Dolben Avenue, and wait for a car to pass from right to left (ie from the A45) and follow that car through the village, and it turns off at the London Road roundabout or just before - obviously to save a short amount of distance (but probably no time saving) - if the signs reduced these vehicles by 20% it might be a noticeable reduction.	YES	NO
C397	Essential.	YES	NO
C398	Could more be done to discourage bad parking in Church Street near the school?	YES	NO

C399	Spencer Parade continues to be a bottleneck.	YES	NO
C400	Providing they are realistic. Perceptions of congestion are exaggerated by some members of the community.	YES	NO
C401	I agree with traffic calming measures but I do not agree with reducing the speed limit. Adding a weight and size restriction would reduce the amount of lorries in the village.	YES	NO
C402	We need to be careful not to kill off a 'vibrant buzz' to our village.	YES	NO
C403	Parking around PO office still a problem, despite the planters	YES	NO
C404	Stanwick is already seeing increased traffic due to the Darsdale development, this and current / existing issues need addressed prior to any consideration of traffic from new Stanwick developments.	YES	NO
C405	West Street residents need off-road areas to park (such as near the recycling bins near Hawkes Technical) and some areas of no parking zones to allow for passing zones.	YES	NO
C406	Essential	YES	NO
C407	While the solutions are good not enough is being done at the moment to help the village with this problem.	YES	NO
C408	Educate people to use the bypass (maybe)?	YES	NO
C409	Parking congestion has already reached crisis point, with a negative impact on residents & pedestrians, eg pavements becoming impassable. Illegal parking is rife & is not penalised.	YES	NO
C410	Traffic flow in Spencer Parade needs to be improved	YES	NO
C411	Objective is fine, but development in Raunds will exacerbate problems.	YES	NO
C412	Could I suggest at either approach to the village - road signs with "VILLAGE - ACCESS ONLY" be on display - I appreciate they cannot be enforced - however, on a number of times that, if I want to go into Raunds, I turn left at the bottom of Dolben Avenue, and wait for a car to pass from right to left (ie from the A45) and follow that car through the village, and it turns off at the London Road roundabout or just before - obviously to save a short amount of distance (but probably no time saving) - if the signs reduced these vehicles by 20% it might be a noticeable reduction.	YES	NO
C413	Is it possible to create Resident Parking Permits for residents of Spencer Parade?	YES	NO
C414	I do not see any solution to parking and traffic volume. The building being done it will get worse. It's hard enough getting down Spencer Parade now.	YES	NO
C415	Good luck trying to get parking on space that doesn't exist!	YES	NO
C416	This is an insurmountable problem	YES	NO
C417	Agree with Objective 3 but would welcome substantive proposals re: "... parking provision is constrained ... lead to congestion"	YES	YES
C418	Visiting parking warden may be useful. There are junctions which are unsafe at times due to careless parking.	YES	NO
C419	We cannot have more congestion/traffic. Dangerous to pedestrians health and possible risk of road accident increases.	YES	NO
C420	No mention of A45 dualling to A14 or Spencer Parade widening to alleviate parking / congestion.	YES	NO
C421	Also reinforce 1-way traffic behaviour in Villa Lane & speed.	YES	NO
C422	Parking around the Village Hall area is a big concern. Lack of places. Obviously living on Spencer Parade speeding traffic - more volume of traffic not using the bypass year on year.	YES	NO

TRANSPORT		Relevant to:	
Q14 - Are you satisfied with the Transport Objective 4: "To create a safer more accessible environment for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users"?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C423	There are vehicles that block the verge and pavement on the corner of East Street with The Avenue. How are you going to create a safer environment? What are the measures to mitigate the impacts of traffic? How many people have been prosecuted for illegal parking or speeding in the village?	YES	NO
C424	The proposals are good but too hard to implement all issues here. Too many unanswered questions for the future.	YES	NO
C425	Needs another crossing for pedestrians. Needs a pedestrian bridge over the A45 [??] for safety reasons	YES	NO
C426	You cannot do that with everything that's going on here and in the surrounding area.	YES	NO
C427	Continues to be a problem speeding through main street (Spencer Parade). No one stops to let you through. Cars parked get hit. School runs cause congestion. Crossing to Stanwick Lakes should have happened when the quarry [was] there.	YES	NO
C428	The number of vehicles speeding through the villager, at certain parts of the day are unacceptable.	YES	NO
C429	V. dangerous at present	YES	NO
C430	Very concerned about main road can we look at traffic calming measures. The bus service is appalling.	YES	NO
C431	Land needs to be allocated, purchased to create resident parking for Spencer Parade (eg land owned by Hawkes Technical could be used to create car park).	YES	NO
C432	Someone is going to get killed, crossing the A45 to get to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C433	No means to access Stanwick Lakes without crossing busy A45	YES	NO
C434	It's important to note that existing pathways need to be maintained and improved in some cases too.	YES	NO
C435	Essential.	YES	NO
C436	The council needs to prioritise what works are required using all current data.	YES	NO
C437	The objective is commendable, but the comments imply it is not achievable & is likely to get worse.	YES	NO
C438	Need traffic control along West Street and Spencer Parade	YES	NO
C439	Look at parking problems in and around High Street & Church Street junctions.	YES	NO
C440	The council needs to prioritise what works are required using all current data.	YES	NO
C441	No detail of how this is going to be achieved. Very satisfied if this is achieved.	YES	NO
C442	Traffic calming measures within the village is an urgent priority	YES	NO
C443	No detail of how this is going to be achieved. Very satisfied if this is achieved.	YES	NO
C444	Parking prohibited on Main Road, Spencer Parade, West Street, High Street, Church Street	YES	NO
C445	Providing everything in Q13 (But I cannot see anything positive being done to stop vehicles parking on pavements, over junctions, on double yellow lines & outside schools. To temper the speed of traffic calming measures are needed) is resolved.	YES	NO
C446	No mention of A45 dualling to A14 or Spencer Parade widening to alleviate parking / congestion.	YES	NO
C447	ENSURE safety.	YES	NO
C448	Stanwick needs to deter through traffic from Raunds to the A45. The bus service is good in the daytime but can cause problems in evenings and Sundays for teenagers and elderly.	YES	NO
C449	Objective is fine, but development in Raunds will exacerbate problems.	YES	NO
C450	Width restrictions should be in place (except for access) to stop large lorries passing through.	YES	NO

TRANSPORT		Relevant to:	
Q15 - Are you satisfied with the Transport Policy TRA1?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C451	Glad to see something is being considered even if it is a very late stage considering obvious issues that exist today.	YES	NO
C452	Footpaths that are narrowed by vegetation for a good part of the year on Spencer Parade and volume and speed of traffic. It's a wonder there have been no fatalities.	YES	NO
C453	Weekend buses needed	YES	NO
C454	We should widen the scope of this policy to include bidding for funds from developments in surrounding towns and villages which have an impact on traffic through Stanwick.	YES	YES
C455	If achieved.	YES	NO
C456	Need a direct bus route to Wellingborough Train Station.	YES	NO
C457	The crossover to Stanwick Lakes needs to be safer for pedestrians. Traffic lights? Bridge?	YES	NO
C458	I am very concerned about the level of traffic that will come through the village from the new housing development, Chelveston Road, Raunds.	YES	NO
C459	No solution has been proposed for the imminent potential problems arising from traffic flows in the village as a result of the Darsdale Development (Raunds).	YES	NO
C460	The bus service meets my needs now	YES	NO
C461	Look at congestion problems in Church Street especially as this area has the school and nursery.	YES	NO
C462	Too many impatient, rude and arrogant drivers about to do that.	YES	NO
C463	If I have understood correctly, 'developer contributions' will only be made where a 'development' takes place, which seems unlikely under the aims of the plan. Improvements to the bus service are also unlikely.	YES	NO
C464	If achieved.	YES	NO
C465	We need to reduce Stanwick as a "cut-through" traffic route.	YES	NO
C466	Who wants to use a bus when they have a car? Unless it was free.	YES	NO
C467	Too much talk, not enough action!	YES	NO
C468	Bus services - to be meaningful, would need commitment from bus companies. Also must be realistic re: commuting preferences. Also needs to mention traffic noise.	YES	NO
C469	Traffic 'problems' in the village have never been addressed. Volume - Speeding - Safety	YES	NO
C470	Waffle	YES	NO
C471	More yellow lines to stop parking.	YES	NO
C472	We should widen the scope of this policy to include bidding for funds from developments in surrounding towns and villages which have an impact on traffic through Stanwick.	YES	YES
C473	Stanwick needs to deter through traffic from Raunds to the A45. The bus service is good in the daytime but can cause problems in evenings and Sundays for teenagers and elderly. A bridge to Stanwick Lakes will help with cyclists and pedestrians crossing A45.	YES	NO
C474	Too many cars, vans and lorries use Stanwick as a cut-through.	YES	NO
C475	Not good	YES	NO
C476	Any developer contributions towards mitigation need to be in place with mitigation proven to be working prior to development occurring / starting. Not sure many of Stanwick's traffic problems can be mitigated on as developer contributions to mitigation might not work & problems increase regardless.	YES	NO

C477	Development of public transport to St Neots & north to Peterborough	YES	NO
C478	You will not be able to mitigate impact because you will be increasing it by developer impact itself.	YES	NO
C479	You need to put in a safe link between the village and Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C480	Laudable general aims but how specifically are they to be achieved?	YES	NO
C481	Poor transport system. Expensive.	YES	NO
C482	Darsdale new housing will have a massive impact.	YES	NO
C483	Double yellow lines outside of the school to prevent school-run idiots blocking Church Street. They can WALK to the school.	YES	NO
C484	No mention of A45 dualling to A14 or Spencer Parade widening to alleviate parking / congestion.	YES	NO
C485	Parking prohibited on Main Road, Spencer Parade, West Street, High Street, Church Street	YES	NO
C486	Temporary traffic lights at West Street, Spencer Parade at peak times.	YES	NO
TRANSPORT		Relevant to:	
Q16 - Are you satisfied with the Transport Policy TRA2?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C487	No real development in village so not relevant. See comments about Gladmans (Gladman's development does not contribute to the improvement of the village and should be opposed at every opportunity).	YES	NO
C488	Purchase land north side of Spencer Parade for parking and then double yellow lines (no parking) in Spencer Parade.	YES	NO
C489	Would not like to see speed bumps introduced as a means of traffic calming.	YES	NO
C490	Add 'The Avenue' speeding problem!	YES	NO
C491	Again, without development & the resultant 'contributions', how will these measures be funded? They are needed now.	YES	NO
C492	What's the proposal developers would be contributing to?	YES	NO
C493	Traffic supposed to bypass Stanwick. Too many lorries. Buses struggle to get through.	YES	NO
C494	This depends on the type of traffic calming measures used.	YES	NO
C495	Footpaths that are narrowed by vegetation for a good part of the year on Spencer Parade and volume and speed of traffic. It's a wonder there have been no fatalities.	YES	NO
C496	Must introduce speed restrictions soon. Higham Road speed restriction to 40 mph and horse signs either end.	YES	NO
C497	There needs to be a solution for Church Street, traffic drives too fast and parking is a problem. Maybe a permit scheme? We need a solution before something major happens to an individual.	YES	NO
C498	By contributions does this mean monetary? Do not let monetary / financial promises to improve a separate problem sway decisions to allow housing developments.	YES	NO
C499	Speed restrictions must be put in place as existing ones are not having an effect at all	YES	NO
C500	We should widen the scope of this policy to include bidding for funds from developments in surrounding towns and villages which have an impact on traffic through Stanwick. Traffic calming on Raunds Road particularly before the pedestrian crossing by the school should be the No.1 priority.	YES	NO
C501	If projected developments are negligible, contributions will be small.	YES	NO
C502	If necessary and we get to this stage.	YES	NO
C503	As things are I am not sure what kind of traffic calming could be undertaken	YES	NO
C504	Spencer Parade requires sections of no parking to allow 2-way traffic. At times parking causes extreme congestion.	YES	NO
C505	Yes, but not in favour of 'bumps'.	YES	NO

C506	What speed restriction / calming ?	YES	NO
C507	The village does not need speed humps.	YES	NO
C508	What developer contributions? We have enough signage, already have speed highlighted.	YES	NO
C509	Will Northants Highways insist on anything?	YES	NO
C510	Adding speed restrictions through the entire village could cause more accidents along Spencer Parade and West Street. I agree that traffic calming measures could work.	YES	NO
C511	Waste of time and money	YES	NO
C512	Any developer contributions towards mitigation need to be in place with mitigation proven to be working prior to development occurring / starting. Not sure many of Stanwick's traffic problems can be mitigated on as developer contributions to mitigation might not work & problems increase regardless.	YES	NO
C513	Not "will be sought" but "must be made"	YES	YES
C514	Also have concerns that too often vehicles do not stop at zebra crossing on Raunds Road even though pedestrians are waiting on pavement ready to cross.	YES	NO
C515	Very little done or to be done by current developers in Raunds to make the village less susceptible to speeding traffic	YES	NO
C516	Contributions should be considerable and relative to any scheme approved.	YES	NO
C517	However, speed restrictions should also be considered for roads other than those specified such as High Street, Higham Road.	YES	NO
C518	We should already have [strategies] in place and not wait for a developer to take on these issues just because they want to build here in Stanwick.	YES	NO
C519	The parked cars on Spencer Parade / Church Street stop any speeding on those roads. Traffic calming on Raunds Road passed the school / church is needed though.	YES	NO
C520	That's laughable.	YES	NO
C521	Some people speed too fast	YES	NO
C522	Why not include Chelveston Road	YES	YES
C523	Urgent need to look at parking and volume of traffic on Spencer Parade.	YES	NO
C524	Not required, sort out parking 1st, then see if speeding reduces, most cases of speeding probably caused by frustration.	YES	NO
C525	Would not like to see speed bumps as a method of traffic calming. Like the idea of electronic signs displaying current speed.	YES	NO
C526	The amount of traffic currently speeding along Raunds Road. Not really safe to cross from the Bus Stop close to Pocket Park.	YES	NO
C527	We should widen the scope of this policy to include bidding for funds from developments in surrounding towns and villages which have an impact on traffic through Stanwick. Traffic calming on Raunds Road particularly before the pedestrian crossing by the school should be the No.1 priority.	YES	YES
C528	Irrelevant - Speeds in Spencer Parade already reduced by parking - developer contributions should be to widen Spencer Parade.	YES	NO
C529	Totally necessary.	YES	NO
C530	High Street should be included	YES	NO
C531	I agree with proposals in TRA2 but already there is a much increased traffic flow along East Street, Grange Road and Higham Road. Particularly commercial vans. This route is much used by pedestrians.	YES	NO
C532	Reduce speeding.	YES	NO
C533	Essential	YES	NO

C534	Any speed restrictions to 20 mph should only be put in place between Villa Lane and the Village Hall. Any longer distance would cause accidents due to drivers losing concentration. (Road should psychologically be 20 mph.)	YES	NO
C535	I have not witnessed anyone speeding! Speeding is illegal - install speed cameras. Please, please, please, no speed bumps!	YES	NO
C536	Again, need to see more progress	YES	NO
C537	Have 7.5 tonne weight limit for entire village	YES	NO
C538	Thought should be applied to speed restrictions or traffic calming in Mansfield Street	YES	NO
TRANSPORT		Relevant to:	
Q17 - Are you satisfied with the Transport Policy TRA3?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C539	Needs another crossing for pedestrians. Needs a pedestrian bridge over the A45 [??] for safety reasons	YES	NO
C540	Should have safe pedestrian access to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C541	Access other than crossing the A45 to Stanwick Lakes is urgently needed.	YES	NO
C542	We only have one - we need more!	YES	NO
C543	It worries us when these policies mention 'new housing developers' quite a lot	YES	NO
C544	Need footbridge over A45 & extend footpath from Old Garage to the Courtyard Hotel on Courtyard side of road	YES	NO
C545	The amount of traffic currently speeding along Raunds Road. Not really safe to cross from the Bus Stop close to Pocket Park.	YES	NO
C546	Not to detriment of having a grass verge to, as per Chelveston Road development in Raunds- Very poor	YES	NO
C547	Bridge to Stanwick Lakes. Urgent.	YES	NO
C548	But footpaths need to be maintained. Sometimes it's safer to walk in the road.	YES	NO
C549	Stop parking on the paths	YES	NO
C550	Not to detriment of having a grass verge to, as per Chelveston Road development in Raunds- Very poor	YES	NO
C551	More	YES	NO
C552	Stanwick needs to deter through traffic from Raunds to the A45. The bus service is good in the daytime but can cause problems in evenings and Sundays for teenagers and elderly. A bridge to Stanwick Lakes will help with cyclists and pedestrians crossing A45.	YES	NO
C553	Monitor the turning curve, children are told to stay on pavement - cars do drive up and park very quickly regularly.	YES	NO
C554	This needs to be done for existing houses	YES	NO
C555	Footpaths that are narrowed by vegetation for a good part of the year on Spencer Parade and volume and speed of traffic. It's a wonder there have been no fatalities.	YES	NO
C556	Problems for pedestrians only occur due to poor parking on junctions of High Street and Church Street	YES	NO
C557	More crossings should be provided especially the Shop and Pub areas	YES	NO
C558	That's laughable.	YES	NO
C559	I would have thought that was Law anyway!	YES	NO
C560	NCC should be encouraged to seek Section 278 Agreements to upgrade existing sub-standard footways adjacent to any development.	YES	NO
C561	It worries us when these policies mention 'new housing developers' quite a lot	YES	NO
C562	No easy way for Stanwick residents to cross A45 to Stanwick Lakes (safety issues for the young & old residents)	YES	NO
C563	? Improve access to Stanwick Lakes. V. dangerous crossing. ? Traffic Lights.	YES	NO
C564	Someone is going to get killed, crossing the A45 to get to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C565	What safe access, especially Spencer Parade & A45 - Stanwick Lakes.	YES	NO

C566	Cross out "where appropriate and practical"	YES	YES
C567	Make space opposite Potters a car park	YES	NO
C568	Developers make promises they don't always fulfil. Perhaps these should be put in before houses are built.	YES	NO
C569	Spencer Parade speeding traffic someone is eventually going to get knocked down. More and more traffic using it as a short cut to get on A45. They must be educated into using the bypass.	YES	NO
C570	Cars should not be parked on pathways near Post Office obstructing vision when crossing. People use paths not cars.	YES	NO
C571	NCC should be encouraged to seek Section 278 Agreements to upgrade existing sub-standard footways adjacent to any development.	YES	NO
C572	Cars not to park on paths	YES	NO
C573	Developers make promises they don't always fulfil. Perhaps these should be put in before houses are built.	YES	NO
C574	Keep existing footpaths accessible & tidy. Add some new ones.	YES	NO
C575	Traffic lights at Stanwick roundabout to help the flow of traffic out of the village & to help pedestrians access to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C576	New footpaths will be fine BUT existing paths in Stanwick are in terrible patched up condition.	YES	NO
TRANSPORT		Relevant to:	
Q18 - Are you satisfied with the Transport Policy TRA4?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C577	Policy good - Practical terms - Planning needs to support you.	YES	NO
C578	But probably not possible.	YES	NO
C579	This proposal will not relieve travelling through & parking in the village.	YES	NO
C580	Off-street parking is a MUST for all new housing	YES	NO
C581	Create parking bays opposite houses in Spencer Parade (take wall down and create bays). Double yellow on house side.	YES	NO
C582	Very good idea, but do ENDC support this for planning applications?	YES	NO
C583	Policy good - Practical terms - Planning needs to support you.	YES	NO
C584	Most houses have more than one car, so what will happen to the other cars that come with each new dwelling where are they going to park!	YES	NO
C585	Very poor.	YES	NO
C586	However a 4-bedroom house with 4 parking spaces out the front might make the area look like a car park and won't be visually attractive.	YES	NO
C587	Getting people to park off-road is not as easy as you think. People are very lazy.	YES	NO
C588	Unrealistic and not in line with current planning requirements.	YES	NO
C589	Houses now generally have 2+ cars. One off-street space is not enough, per room is acceptable but I do not agree with the statement 'unless justified'.	YES	NO
C590	A garage space fulfils this criteria presumably.	YES	NO
C591	More needs to be provided particularly for those living on Spencer Parade.	YES	NO
C592	This proposal will not relieve travelling through & parking in the village.	YES	NO
C593	Need more places to park off roads	YES	NO
C594	People with off-street parking not using it, and therefore creating more problems for those without.	YES	NO
C595	Surely with a large home it's unlikely that there would be 5 cars for 5 bedrooms.	YES	NO
C596	I think that this is unlikely to happen. (1 parking space per bedroom!)	YES	NO
C597	Nowhere else to park. Are you going to magic up some car parking. Would love to see that!!	YES	NO
C598	Off-street parking on Spencer Parade.	YES	NO

C599	Unrealistic and not in line with current planning requirements.	YES	NO
C600	People parking in Villa Lane - several cars in there with own off-street parking. Needs to be addressed.	YES	NO
C601	Parking restrictions need to be extended & enforced to prevent congestion getting worse.	YES	NO
C602	On-street parking causes real problems for road users & pedestrians alike	YES	NO
C603	Insufficient available at key areas such as village shop and Stanwick Club and nothing obvious being done to address dysfunctional consequences thereof.	YES	NO
C604	This is a task due to village build with terraces lining streets	YES	NO
C605	Insufficient off-street parking throughout village	YES	NO
C606	Village Hall a problem.	YES	NO
C607	All residents should be encouraged to provide off-street parking as well as new builds.	YES	NO
C608	No more development	YES	NO
C609	The amount of traffic currently speeding along Raunds Road. Not really safe to cross from the Bus Stop close to Pocket Park.	YES	NO
C610	P.S. Is there any way that the buses can run on Sunday again?	YES	NO
C611	Not addressed	YES	NO
C612	This is so important that any new homes have off-street parking / garages.	YES	NO
C613	We must provide more parking for local amenities.	YES	NO
C614	Definitely needed.	YES	NO
C615	Parking space requirements should also apply to businesses, eg off-street provision for employees & customers.	YES	NO
C616	Good luck with this one!	YES	NO
C617	What does 'otherwise justified' mean?	YES	NO
C618	Totally agree. 1 parking space per bedroom.	YES	NO
C619	Good idea but cross out "unless otherwise justified" which is an escape clause!	YES	NO
C620	Again, needs to be addressed	YES	NO
C621	Good luck with this one!	YES	NO
C622	I have seen cars double park and we need two way traffic in Spencer Parade	YES	NO
C623	Requires more	YES	NO
C624	Space for each bedroom? Is this practicable?	YES	NO
C625	Needed	YES	NO

OPEN SPACES		Relevant to:	
Q19 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Objective 5: "To preserve and promote green areas within the village and wider parish to retain Stanwick's rural identity"?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C626	Very important for village life and community benefit.	YES	NO
C627	Very desirable.	YES	NO
C628	Plans to upgrade park opposite Bowls Club very welcome.	YES	NO
C629	Essential to preserve rural feel to village	YES	NO
C630	Good work being carried [on] with Community Garden and Allotments (Well done).	YES	NO
C631	We need these areas, very important for health and company integration.	YES	NO
C632	Preserve all green areas within the parish boundaries	YES	NO
C633	Excellent idea	YES	NO
C634	Very important to us. Main reason we moved here.	YES	NO
C635	Very important to us. Main reason we moved here.	YES	NO
C636	We are in dire need of safe pedestrian access to Stanwick Lakes! Please prioritise this.	YES	NO
C637	Can the parish council do more to encourage people to get involved with the Pocket Park / Community Garden?	YES	NO
C638	Too much is being built on. Trees cut down not replaced. Need dog park designated area. Dog mess a problem.	YES	NO
C639	How can you promote green areas when the ENDC seem hell bent on building on our lovely rural landscape.	YES	NO
OPEN SPACES			
Q20 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Objective 6: "To ensure Stanwick has the appropriate open space provisions, community and recreational facilities to support members of the community of all ages"?			
C640	Re safe pedestrian access to Stanwick Lakes: keeping roundabout clear and relocation of road sign would help in creating clear visibility for crossing as currently pedestrian visibility is poor, or better still a pelican crossing.	YES	NO
C641	I would love safe pedestrian access to the Lakes that is suitable for wheelchairs & pushchairs etc. However if we got this we would also need some sort of residents-only parking scheme as people would avoid the Stanwick Lakes charge & fill all roads with more cars. Current Stanwick blue parking issues need addressed.	YES	NO
C642	Pedestrian access to the Lakes is a problem. However, [consider] that opening a safe access route will most likely lead to parking issues nearby in the village ... so is not as straightforward as it might suggest.	YES	NO
C643	Improve play facilities - if appropriate	YES	NO
C644	While I agree with open space and parish boundary restriction, the open space part needs to be looked into more clearly as some small pockets are in village.	YES	NO
C645	I endorse the need for formalisation of footpaths (& map?) & safe pedestrian access to Stanwick Lakes. Also suggest that buses should stop at or near the Stanwick Lakes entrance at peak usage times.	YES	NO
C646	As a village we do well with community projects and I agree with all the hard work being shown (Well done).	YES	NO
C647	We need more	YES	NO
C648	Stanwick village residents need access to Stanwick Lakes, currently crossing the A45 on foot is <u>highly</u> dangerous	YES	NO
C649	Easier access to Stanwick Lakes is something that would improve safety to the community. (I'm a runner!)	YES	NO
C650	What better open space than seeing fields and hedges with the wild birds singing which will disappear soon with all the development.	YES	NO

C651	Easier access to Stanwick Lakes is something that would improve safety to the community. (I'm a runner!)	YES	NO
C652	Too much is being built on. Trees cut down not replaced. Need dog park designated area. Dog mess a problem. Hedges hacked back never attended to with care.	YES	NO
C653	Have enough Open Spaces, if left alone	YES	NO
OPEN SPACES		Relevant to:	
Q21 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Policy OSP1?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C654	Very important	YES	NO
C655	No further housing development between Stanwick & Raunds	YES	NO
C656	Must be kept at all times now and for future generations.	YES	NO
C657	Hopefully the Strategic Gap will still be able to be considered for further open space opportunities, rather than simply an empty fallow land mass.	YES	NO
C658	Very important	YES	NO
C659	V. important	YES	NO
C660	Needs to be vigorously prosecuted.	YES	NO
C661	Keep us apart with Recreation (Football field)	YES	NO
C662	Essential	YES	NO
C663	Getting closer to Raunds.	YES	NO
C664	Fully agree with stance, Stanwick's "vibe" must be protected.	YES	NO
C665	Very important to maintain identity of village by maintaining boundary and strategic gap	YES	NO
C666	Waste land between Mallows Grange and water works road, marked as green on map is this classed as part of the strategic gap? Assume owned by developer.	YES	NO
C667	Though not in Stanwick Parish, Raunds is getting closer via Warth Park.	YES	NO
C668	Can other areas be designated Areas of Important Open Space eg between Higham Ferrers and Stanwick (distinct area of separation).	YES	YES
C669	Surely no one wants Stanwick joined to Raunds. This is very important.	YES	NO
C670	We must not combine with other villages - we need to keep our identity.	YES	NO
C671	Very important	YES	NO
C672	We need a separation line here	YES	NO
C673	Absolute must if we are to retain identity of Stanwick apart from Raunds.	YES	NO
C674	Given that this may be in place for a long time should keeping a strategic gap around the entire village & neighbouring parishes be considered?	YES	YES
C675	Very important.	YES	NO
C676	We must not as a village location show any ill feelings to our bordering residents (obviously Stanwick and Raunds share amenities which is good).	YES	NO
C677	We are a separate village do not wish to join with Raunds that's been spoilt all the building no more infrastructure for the town (ruined)	YES	NO
C678	This is an important policy. Stanwick and Raunds should not merge.	YES	NO

OPEN SPACES		Relevant to:	
Q22 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Policy OSP2?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C679	Would hate for instance to lose area at the back of Pocket Park (Chettles?) to housing.	YES	NO
C680	No exceptions!	YES	NO
C681	Not to lose any more Open Spaces	YES	NO
C682	Paddocks / grass fields up for sale for housing - not OK.	YES	NO
C683	These areas should not be built on at all.	YES	NO
C684	Open Spaces not to be built on	YES	NO
C685	Agreed.	YES	NO
C686	No development on West Street on land bordering A45. Will become an accident black-spot if given the go-ahead.	YES	NO
C687	We are hemmed in	YES	NO
C688	Agree.	YES	NO
C689	I have an issue with Orchard Farm, East Street. This area could be used for development as infill within Stanwick, if we have to have more housing.	YES	NO
C690	Agreed.	YES	NO
C691	What exceptional circumstances?	YES	NO
C692	V. important	YES	NO
C693	That's what lovely about Stanwick. I expect greed will prevail.	YES	NO
C694	Waste land between Mallows Grange and water works road, marked as green on map is this classed as part of the strategic gap? Assume owned by developer.	YES	NO
OPEN SPACES			
Q23 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Policy OSP3?			
C695	V. important	YES	NO
C696	No developments in Stanwick are supported.	YES	NO
C697	Obviously the school is at capacity. Local health services struggling to cope. These need to be addressed before we can agree to more development.	YES	NO
C698	Will this really happen?	YES	NO
C699	Already answered. (Q22. No development on West Street on land bordering A45. Will become an accident black-spot if given the go-ahead.)	YES	NO
C700	Agree	YES	NO
C701	No Gladman please!	YES	NO
C702	No doctors. No schools. Too many cars.	YES	NO
C703	OSP3 Adversely affect land that is associated with specific flora & fauna, eg badger scent trails.	YES	NO
C704	Is looking at a new house worse than looking at a new warehouse?	YES	NO
C705	No more development need in Stanwick unless doctors, chemist and toilets	YES	NO
C706	Shame (Raunds Council) didn't take this into account when they built Warth Park.	YES	NO
C707	Further development not needed	YES	NO
C708	Traffic will be an issue	YES	NO

C709	Totally agree with OSP3	YES	NO
C710	Stanwick is fine how it is do not need new development facilities are full to the limit	YES	NO
C711	The new warehousing at Raunds is an absolute eyesore and the light pollution is a real problem.	YES	NO
C712	Raunds have a lot to answer for.	YES	NO
C713	To the wildlife and birds firstly. Disruption secondly. Not welcome.	YES	NO
C714	No more development	YES	NO
C715	Any development on land in West Street opposite Stanwick Hotel would be an accident black spot & ruin entrance to the village.	YES	NO
OPEN SPACES		Relevant to:	
Q24 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Policy OSP4?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C716	Obviously the school is at capacity. Local health services struggling to cope. These need to be addressed before we can agree to more development. This needs to be addressed before more development on a large scale is permitted.	YES	NO
C717	Not sure how to answer this.	YES	NO
C718	No new developments in our open spaces.	YES	NO
C719	No more development	YES	NO
C720	Do not need any more sport fields. Have plenty now.	YES	NO
C721	Too much is being built on. Trees cut down not replaced. Need dog park designated area. Dog mess a problem. Separate dog area needed.	YES	NO
C722	That's a laugh	YES	NO
C723	Sounds ok, in theory.	YES	NO
C724	New development should enhance the existing recreational facilities and improve access for residents to Stanwick Lakes, other than trying to cross a dual carriageway!	YES	NO
C725	Youth football struggles not having its own pitch - would be great to find additional space.	YES	NO
C726	Be more imaginative with Open Spaces - Pocket Park poor- Not appealing to youngsters. In my opinion more play stuff required.	YES	NO
C727	Be more imaginative with Open Spaces - Pocket Park poor- Not appealing to youngsters. In my opinion more play stuff required.	YES	NO
C728	[Crossed out]	YES	NO
C729	Specify new open spaces should be accessible to the entire village equally.	YES	NO
C730	Take action	YES	NO
C731	No new development needed.	YES	NO
C732	The wording here would open a can of worms !!	YES	NO
OPEN SPACES			
Q25 - Are you satisfied with the Open Spaces Policy OSP5?			
C733	Trees should be maintained	YES	NO
C734	Resist where possible	YES	NO
C735	Shame this wasn't followed on the East Street development - protected trees were felled!	YES	NO
C736	We must preserve our trees and open spaces for future users.	YES	NO
C737	Must to retain character of village.	YES	NO
C738	Stress word significant -	YES	NO

C739	Stanwick has lost many trees over the past few years (without permission). More trees should be planted by those responsible or fines imposed.	YES	NO
C740	Shame this wasn't followed on the East Street development - protected trees were felled!	YES	NO
C741	We need to plant more trees.	YES	NO
C742	Totally agree	YES	NO
C743	We must keep the "green" areas for our beauty as well as wildlife.	YES	NO
C744	I thought we wanted to preserve the trees and hedgerows. Our poor wildlife and birds are disappearing fast with the loss of habitat.	YES	NO
C745	Developers have been known to remove listed trees because it was cheaper to pay the fine than to build around them (John Eagle Close)	YES	NO
C746	We have lost too many trees and hedgerows - which in turn leads to less wildlife.	YES	NO
C747	Yes, we need more trees, not less.	YES	NO
C748	We have lost too many trees and hedgerows - which in turn leads to less wildlife.	YES	NO
C749	Who would be responsible for the continuing condition of trees of amenity value?	YES	NO
C750	Important to keep all trees where practicable.	YES	NO
C751	Not replaced - hedges destroyed.	YES	NO
C752	Yes, if it makes driving clearer views and to only build above	YES	NO
C753	Too vague - will be resisted.	YES	NO
C754	Height of trees are a big problem, they are currently too high. Would like to see them trimmed by two metres. We have 1 large tree, which is to 20 feet, to left of our property which blocks are [our] sunlight.	YES	NO
C755	Again sounds ok, but will it happen?	YES	NO
C756	If they have rotted	YES	NO
C757	Trees give the village distinctive character. Fully agree.	YES	NO
C758	When John Eagle Close was built a listed tree was removed as the fine was less than the cost of building around it	YES	NO
C759	Only out of necessity - and safety	YES	NO

HERITAGE		Relevant to:	
Q26 - Are you satisfied with the Heritage Objective 7: "To ensure the preservation and enhancement of locally listed heritage assets"?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C760	Old houses, in hall, Church Street to be kept if possible	YES	NO
C761	See page 7 of the Plan:- Bullet point 4. Who owns the stone walls?	YES	NO
C762	Question mark	YES	NO
C763	Not happening	YES	NO
C764	Imperative to maintain village identity. Heritage assets are preserved.	YES	NO
C765	Is the Heritage List on the PC website?	YES	NO
C766	Preserve what we have. Let's stay rural. Appreciate the countryside.	YES	NO
C767	Would be lovely to see a village heritage trail / orienteering trail - to spark local interest in Heritage and also appeal to youth.	YES	NO
Q27 - Are you satisfied with the Heritage Policy HTG1?			
C768	Good idea	YES	NO
C769	All you care about is assets. Money! Money! Money!	YES	NO
C770	Please put in simple English!	YES	NO
Q28 - Are you satisfied with the Heritage Policy HTG2?			
C771	National Planning Policy is all about greed.	YES	NO
C772	Will go ahead whatever	YES	NO
C773	Agree	YES	NO
C774	Should identify / celebrate the former Nene Valley Railway through Stanwick Lakes.	YES	NO
C775	Please put in simple English!	YES	NO
Q29 - Are you satisfied with the Heritage Policy HTG3?			
C776	Please put in simple English!	YES	NO
C777	In these cases permitted development rights should be removed to prevent over-development to Heritage Assets.	YES	NO
C778	It is an adverse effect on my life. Our country is ruined.	YES	NO
Q30 - Are you satisfied with the Heritage Policy HTG4?			
C779	Or look at alternative sites where possible.	YES	NO
C780	None	YES	NO
C781	See above [no comment above]. May refer to: "These are no solutions. Only a gripe that more homes unacceptable!"	YES	NO
C782	Please put in simple English!	YES	NO
C783	Do not develop near heritage assets. Often these are unsettled or harmed during development processes.	YES	NO
C784	Do not do any more.	YES	NO
C785	Keep Stanwick development free so that local heritage is kept how it is	YES	NO
C786	More provision should be made so over-development in these special areas cannot take place.	YES	NO

INFRASTRUCTURE		Relevant to:	
Q31 - Are you satisfied with the Infrastructure Objective "To ensure that infrastructure and services meet the needs of current and future residents"?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C787	Current only	YES	NO
C788	Services at breaking point, so new houses are crazy!	YES	NO
C789	More transport for older residents needed	YES	NO
C790	Required - new doctors surgery or development of existing surgeries in Raunds	YES	NO
C791	A safe crossing point between the village and Stanwick Lakes is long overdue. Priority is long overdue.	YES	NO
C792	I am happy with what is in the plan but this is a very serious issue already affecting the village and cannot be allowed to be exacerbated.	YES	NO
C793	Safe crossing to the Lakes should be a priority.	YES	NO
C794	Crossing point to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C795	Although we don't have water pressure issues generally, we definitely need a safe crossing to the Lakes.	YES	NO
C796	Although we don't have water pressure issues generally, we definitely need a safe crossing to the Lakes.	YES	NO
C797	Too complex area for any developments to implement in future, this will always be a problem and more building in Stanwick will make it worse.	YES	NO
C798	Now	YES	NO
C799	Difficult to develop infrastructure to keep pace with increased population & housing	YES	NO
C800	This appears to be a place marker rather than any form of forward looking plan - no real vision, no mission statement, disappointing.	YES	NO
C801	Totally agree	YES	NO
C802	Everything is currently at capacity. New homes being built in Raunds, infrastructure will be pushed hard. It cannot cope with much more from Stanwick - NO big developments in Stanwick.	YES	NO
C803	Crossing point to Stanwick Lakes	YES	NO
C804	A safe crossing to Stanwick Lakes is a high priority	YES	NO
C805	Safe crossing Stanwick Lakes.	YES	NO
C806	It sounds like there are a few problems with the infrastructure already!	YES	NO
C807	The needs of residents is not taken into account at all. It's a nightmare going anywhere when the school is coming out now!	YES	NO
C808	But ensure that all services are closely scrutinised.	YES	NO
C809	As commented in Q13 (Development elsewhere already affect traffic through the village. Infrastructure must be considered before development and not afterwards, ie must be proactive.), infrastructure must be considered before and above development. Infrastructure is already poor. See also comment re: access to Lakes Q20 (Pedestrian access to the Lakes is a problem. However, [consider] that opening a safe access route will most likely lead to parking issues nearby in the village ... so is not as straightforward as it might suggest.).	YES	NO
C810	A must.	YES	NO
C811	Rather than waiting for developers there is no reason why representations should not be made to these service providers to make improvements in village, eg BT Broadband.	YES	NO
C812	Infrastructure & services do not currently meet needs of residents. This should be required to be met before development consideration which would also need to prove additional needs would be met.	YES	NO
C813	Ref to infrastructure needs to be explicit about resourcing - classrooms no use without teachers, bigger surgery no use without more doctors.	YES	NO
C814	The comments demonstrate that the infrastructure is already under strain. All items should be addressed as a matter of urgency.	YES	NO

C815	The village is at breaking - precisely the reason the proposed "198" houses cannot go ahead.	YES	NO
C816	We have a disabled son with learning disabilities. He enjoys cycling when he visits, but we always have to travel to Stanwick Lakes by car as we cannot take the risk with him crossing the A45. Apart from the risks of crossing such a fast busy road, we are causing unnecessary damage to the environment by having to use our car.	YES	NO
C817	Take care - a link to Stanwick Lakes could bring a parking problem. There is an underpass at the bottom of Cotton Lane.	YES	NO
C818	No doctors. No school places. No dentists. Not much police service to mention but a few. A lot needs looking at.	YES	NO
C819	Water supply / pressure a big problem currently without additional developments. Safe crossing to Stanwick Lakes paramount of importance. Obvious strains on traffic / parking & places at doctors & school cannot take any more.	YES	NO
C820	Clearly in favour of the general objective.	YES	NO
C821	Safe crossing points to Lakes essential.	YES	NO
C822	Safe crossing to the Lakes should be a priority.	YES	NO
C823	But can the PC do more to encourage new businesses / shops to set up in Stanwick?	YES	YES
C824	Rather than waiting for developers there is no reason why representations should not be made to these service providers to make improvements in village, eg BT Broadband.	YES	NO
C825	A45 dualling Stanwick - A14 essential - Spencer Parade widening to remove car park congestion.	YES	NO
C826	Urgent.	YES	NO
C827	Even if Stanwick were to grow by a large number we would still not get a doctors surgery as stated by NHS England any extra funding would go to Raunds	YES	NO
C828	Stanwick does not need more housing.	YES	NO
INFRASTRUCTURE		Relevant to:	
Q32 - Are you satisfied with the Infrastructure Policy IFR1?		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C829	I hope this is true & will be considered.	YES	NO
C830	No developments, our infrastructure is poor, we cannot support anything more. Roads are poor, water pressure poor, broadband is shocking, the school is too small & there is no healthcare. Do not develop in Stanwick.	YES	NO
C831	New developments should only be allowed if they improve infrastructure for the whole village.	YES	NO
C832	The doctors at The Cottons is v. poor and not fit for purpose [at the moment]	YES	NO
C833	Services at breaking point, so new houses are crazy!	YES	NO
C834	Some are a must, some not	YES	NO
C835	The lack of adequate services and no facilities is already an issue.	YES	NO
C836	No developments should be considered because we have many infrastructure problems now as listed it will only get worse. We have reached max now!	YES	NO
C837	No more "New Developments".	YES	NO
C838	I suggest that new developments be only considered where they can demonstrate they improve infrastructure in Stanwick more than just the expected impact of the development, i.e. they make it better for all.	YES	NO
C839	[Crossed out]	YES	NO
C840	?	YES	NO
C841	As stated (More transport for older residents needed)	YES	NO

C842	Don't know how you intend to comply with something that doesn't exist!	YES	NO
C843	In favour of the general thinking.	YES	NO
C844	Needs a reference to natural drainage, as monitored over time, not just a single winter which is likely to understate the worst case.	YES	YES
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		Relevant to:	
		Neighbourhood Plan	Policies
C845	Additional parking. Smaller houses. Affordable / Social.	YES	NO
C846	Transport: Biggest problem in Stanwick by far.	YES	NO
C847	(Heritage) Wonderful ideals. Practical???	YES	NO
C848	Thank you for preparing it [the consultation form]	YES	NO
C849	Seems like an anti-housing plan!	YES	NO
C850	(Heritage) Wonderful ideals. Practical???	YES	NO
C851	This is an ambitious development plan. I really hope the council will adhere to what it says as ultimately, the quality of life for present and future generations is at stake	YES	NO
C852	This is an ambitious development plan. I really hope the council will adhere to what it says as ultimately, the quality of life for present and future generations is at stake	YES	NO
C853	Final thoughts – Completely agree with everything – However – how much ‘sway’ will this ultimately have, as I feel a company such as Gladman can come in with their applications for 230 and 198 new houses, appeal against the rejections, and the appeal decisions do not have to take the Neighbourhood Plan into consideration at all, and this Plan and protests by residents ultimately have only a minor influence on ‘political’ decisions taken in Whitehall. Just a thought. Keep up the good work though.	YES	NO
C854	Concerned about possible development of sites that could have Roman remains. In the past, 'remains' have been discovered any new discoveries could be an asset to the village if managed correctly.	YES	NO
C855	For future reference, it might be worth simplifying the wording on these forms, to appeal to a wider selection of residents living in Stanwick.	YES	NO
C856	Stanwick villagers do an amazing job of litter picking and ensuring areas are cared for, good community spirit.	YES	NO
C857	My wife and I feel we did not do justice to this exercise. It was far from easy dealing conscientiously and satisfactorily with all the documents and 'officialese language'. There should have been more columns than just satisfied or dissatisfied, both strong terms. However, we appreciate all the work of the parish council.	YES	NO