



WERRINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EVIDENCE FILE:

C3 - CONSULTATION STATEMENT APPENDIX F

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESULTS

APPENDIX F: REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESULTS
PART ONE: DETAIL OF CONSULTEES CONTACTED, THEIR COMMENTS AND
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN RESPONSES

Following the statutory consultation stage carried out in accordance with Regulation 14 from 17th January to 29th February 2024 the following comments were received, and action taken to incorporate into the Neighbourhood Plan as follows:

Consultee	Method	Response
Residents and Visitors	Various	See separate detail in Part 2 below
120 Werrington Businesses	Delivered letter	No specific comment made but it is known that some business owners are included in the resident's responses.
Peterborough Local Planning Authority	Email	Email in response dated 29 th February 2024. See Part 3 and 4 below
Selected Peterborough City Council Officers: Tree Officer, Estate Dept, Planning, Natural and Historic Environment	Email	See response from Peterborough Local Planning Authority.
Ward Councillors: Councillors Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Bryan Tyler, John Fox, Judy Fox, Stephen Lane	Email	No comment made
Landowners: Peakirk Parochial Church Council Milton Estates Owner of the fields to the north	Email Post Post	No comment made. Letter in response dated 7 th February 2024 See Part 3 below. No comment made
Schools, Academies & Trusts: Welbourne Primary School William Law Primary School Werrington Primary School Ken Stimpson Academy Queen Katherine Academy Thomas Deacon Education Trust 4Cs Multi Academy Trust, Soke Academy Trust Peterborough Diocese Education Trust	Email Email Email Email Email Email Email Email Post	No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made
Parish Councils Glinton Parish Council Peakirk Newborough Bretton Marholm	Email Email Email Online Online	No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made. No comment made
Homes England	Email	No comment made.
Regulator of Social Housing	Email	No comment made.
Natural England	Email	Email in response dated 28 th February 2024. See Part 3 and 4 below
Environment Agency	Email	Email in response dated 26 th February 2024. See Part 3 and 4 below
Historic Buildings & Monuments Commission	Email	Email in response dated 14 th February 2024. See Part 3 and 4 below

Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	Email and Post	Email bounced back, letter sent, no comment made
--	----------------	--

Consultee	Method	Response
Highways Agency	Email	No comment made.
Marine Management Organisation	Email	No comment made.
British Telecom/EE	Post	No comment made.
Mobile Operators Association	Email	No comment made.
Plusnet	Post	No comment made.
T-Mobile (UK) Ltd	Post	No comment made.
O2	Post	No comment made.
Three	Post	No comment made.
Vodafone plc	Post	No comment made.
Virgin Mobile plc	Post	No comment made.
UK Power Networks	Post	No comment made.
NHS (Cambs & Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)	Email	No comment made.
Northwest Anglia NHS Foundation Trust	Email	No comment made.
British Gas	Email	No comment made.
Anglian Water	Email	Email in response dated 29 th February 2024 See Part 3 below
Peterborough Civic Society	Email	No comment made.
Werrington Local History Group	Email	No comment made.
Werrington Allotment Association	Email	Email in response dated 25 th February 2024 See Part 3 below
Werrington Community Association	Email	No comment made
Werrington Neighbourhood Council	Email	Email response dated 27 th February 2024 See Part 3 below
Peterborough Racial Equality Council	Email	No comment made
Werrington Parish Church	Email	No comment made
Peterborough & Cambs Chamber of Commerce	Email	No comment made
Disability Peterborough	Email	No comment made
Disability Champion Cllr Tyler	Email	No comment made
Sport England	Email	No comment made
Peterborough Environment City Trust	Email	No comment made
Wildlife Trust	Email	No comment made
BCN Wildlife Trust	Email	No comment made
Cambridgeshire Police	Post	No comment made

PART TWO: WRITTEN COMMENTS MADE BY RESIDENTS IN RESPONSE TO REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

In accordance with the principles of data protection, individual names of local residents are not identified in this Consultation Statement. Redacted copies of all representations received can be viewed on request.

Reference Date	Comment	Response
<p>1: Online 18/1/24</p>	<p>I am in agreement and endorse everything detailed in these chapters, with particular emphasis on the green spaciousness character, maintaining low-density, low-rise housing, the deterioration of Werrington Centre and concerns in the decline in standards of sports facilities and reduction/closure of community assets, i.e.: library, community centres, etc. In total agreement with everything as stated.</p> <p>Totally agree with everything as stated, with particular emphasis on: Car parking problems within the area and the importance of taking car park provision into account in future planning applications; Natural Environment, with emphasis on the retention of the existing open spaces and wide tree-lined roads and footpaths; Recreational Facilities: the importance of supporting and maintaining all the existing facilities for the benefit of all age groups.</p> <p>Thanks to everyone for working so hard in order to present this Plan, in an attempt to retain the lovely character of Werrington which hopefully will be a pleasant place to live for many years ahead.</p>	<p>The supportive comments are noted. No action required.</p>
<p>2: Online 18/1/24</p>	<p>Ken Stimpson field is needed for the community it was intended for. The school have managed years using the field without a fence, it's absolutely ridiculous expecting to take the whole field away from the common. I'm very angry that I could not buy a small concrete area next to my house as I was told open spaces are needed, then the council want to take a whole field away from the community.</p>	<p>The open fields adjacent to Ken Stimpson Academy and owned by Peterborough City Council, are clearly special to Werrington residents. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot, however, respond to the proposed fencing of all / part of the fields adjacent to Ken Stimpson Field nor any pending Planning Permission relating to this.</p> <p>The fields to the north and west of the Academy are a public open space and have been suggested as a designated Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>The area to the south of the Academy has been identified as 'Educational Land' (as advised by Peterborough City Council with</p>

subsequent confirmation provided by Department for Education and the Prime Minister).

It has been decided to exclude this area of educational land from the draft Werrington Neighbourhood Plan's suggested Local Green Space designations for the following reasons:

- Some areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may already have largely unrestricted public access, though even in places like parks there may be some restrictions. Other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access. However, Local Green Space designation guidance also advises that educational sites (grounds and playing fields) would not normally be suitable for designation.
- These school playing fields have been subject to extensive debate about their status during the recent planning considerations relating to the decision to fence either all or part and the fields will be subject to a change of use Planning Application in the near future. *(update July 2024 – Peterborough City Council now advises that it now does not need Planning Permission for change of use and the fence will be installed under 'permitted development')*
- Peterborough City Council would not accept the Neighbourhood Plan with this area included. The Planning group would not have the resources, time nor expertise to be able to challenge any such decision. Any challenge would delay the Plan even further, potentially jeopardising the whole of Plan.
- Even a successful designation as a Local Green Space for the 'Educational Land' will have no influence on the outcome on the fencing of any part of this area.
- Werrington Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed every five years so the position of the 'Educational Land' can be revisited during the next review.
- The designation of the public open space to the north and west will give certain protection to this adjoining area of 'Educational Land'. In addition, the avenue of trees adjacent to this area has been identified as an 'Important Local View' and the perimeter

		<p>woodland/hedgerows (being the original hedge line of one of the original roads to the open fields and boundary of the Manor) has been identified as an important biodiversity area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework would give certain future protection to the fields stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings, or land to be surplus to requirements; or</i> b) <i>the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or</i> c) <i>the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.</i> - There is even better protection by virtue of the fields status as 'Educational Land' as any future development by the Ken Stimpson Academy would need to be approved by Peterborough City Council as Landlord and would need Planning Application consent and further approval of the Secretary of State under both the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and the Academies Act 2010.
<p>3: Online 19/1/24</p>	<p>5.6 Former Sports Ground Fulbridge Road. Your support for our community is greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p>
<p>4: Online 2/1/24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) By way of a general comment, I am impressed by the professionalism that has been shown in the research and preparation of the Plan Documents and establishment / drafting of the policies and statements as well as the navigation of the many legal requirements to ensure its finalisation. This is a lasting testament to several years of hard work by unpaid volunteers acting on behalf of all Werrington residents. Well, done. b) The built environment within the wider village: Inevitably with predicted population growth principally through migration, the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed. b) Comments noted.

Greater Peterborough area will see increasing pressures from National and Local Government to accommodate the need for new housing on a scaled apportionment. Whilst the expectations and requirements contained within the newly launched Peterborough 10-year Local Plan will inevitably take precedence over Neighbourhood Plans, it is vital that the WNC defend robustly its policies and statements written into the WNP to ensure that Werrington's distinctive character remains. Drivers such as Peterborough City Council's asset realisation review will no doubt seek to identify amongst its landholdings plots for housing, as well as to provide additional monies for the City Council.

- c) One of these would be the now long disused school sports field to the rear of Brookside and the adjacent disused allotments to its north side. This field is referred to under point 5.6.2 within the WNP as "being unused for many years" whilst under Appendix B of the relevant Evidence File it is described as being "an overgrown grassed area", "undisturbed" and "mown twice a year", indicating minimal management. This policy is allowing the re-establishment of an enhanced natural environment and species diversity long absent when it was in use and should be considered by the WNC as a part of the basis of objection to any planning application to develop the plot of land. It is noteworthy that the Plan has established an opinion with respect to any future planning application for this area under Point 5.6 of the Natural Environment objectives. This expands a little on the reasons why the now lapsed 2015 application was seen to be so detrimental to the residential amenity of the surrounding area. The increasing ecological potential for the area since it was abandoned will reinforce objections on a number of ecology grounds and the need for more public accessible Green Spaces within the south Werrington area. Unfortunately, under the recommendation section of the report on this plot of land in the evidence files it is stated that "It is not considered to be special enough to the local community for local green space designation and the

WNP7 and WNP9 will help protect certain City Council assets from disposal.

Whilst Werrington Neighbourhood Council have supported the project, it is Werrington Area Forum which has undertaken the development of a Werrington Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of residents.

- c) It has been decided not to support the designation of the former sports ground Fulbridge Road (also known as Brookside Playing Field) as a Local Green Space.
- As the area is enclosed on all sides by the back fences of housing and with no public access, it is difficult to justify that this field is special to the local community and there is insufficient professionally endorsed evidence to support the claim that it is rich in wildlife.
 - Its status is being considered through the Peterborough Local Plan process and Councillors are engaged in determining its future. Promotion of the wildlife of this field with the adjoining overgrown site has been additionally noted as a Community Project.

value of wildlife is limited being a grassed field". This is incorrect and ignores the expansion of wildlife into the area from the wooded portion of the disused allotments on the plot's northern boundary and the long-established boundary hedgerow to the west side. After nearly a decade of abandonment, hedgerow plants and associated wildlife have expanded their habitats into the former grassed area. These boundaries are not managed and the mowing of the grassland by a small ride on mower is of insufficient power to deal with the abundant anthills that have colonised the area.

- d) Natural Environment: Whilst there are many open spaces within the Werrington envelope there are limitations to the establishment and maintenance of general wildlife, flora, and fauna. Open space inevitably mean disturbance through human and domestic animal interactions and damage to habitat, for example the eutrophication of lakes and the Werrington Brook through the introduction of litter and other anthropogenic pollutants, along with the trampling of sensitive species in woodland margins, felling of older trees, slashing of hedges and so on. Hence there are limits to what habitats can be established and maintained or enhanced in a general sense and green networks, shelter belt and hedge line corridors are a vital component of allowing the movement of existing species through the systems as well as the establishment of new ones. The WNC plan and policies need to promote management prescriptions to enable not only the maintenance of the natural environment, but its long-term enhancement.
- e) Veteran trees spaced along the enclosure hedgerow following the line of a medieval open field track which ran south from the village along the line of Chapel Lane, the western boundary the current and former allotments and the former Brookside sports field to the Werrington Brook, seem to have missed a mention in the Schedule of Notable Trees.

- d) The points made here have been addressed by WNP6 as much as it can be by the Neighbourhood Plan. The protection and promotion of the natural environment has been additionally expanded as a Community Project and the local Ward Councillors interest in this area is noted.

- e) Werrington has many notable veteran trees especially in the Conservation Area. Schedule 1 requires notable trees to be individually identified. Access to and the identification of such trees within areas such as the former Manor House grounds proved difficult and similar access problems is envisaged with these trees. Paragraph 5.5.6 has been reworded to include

f) Green open spaces for residents are predominantly located in the northern area of the village envelope with only one in the south named as Werrington Allotment Gardens. The inclusion of this area seems to be somewhat of an anomaly as it is not a general public access area in contrast to the other areas in north Werrington. However, the inclusion of the allotments could provide the vehicle for an expansion of the area with the inclusion of the adjacent disused allotment area which (though now long overgrown and wooded predominately on its southern edge), could offer enhancements to the diversity of habitats seen elsewhere within Werrington. This may need a more restricted management prescription to avoid damage by increased public access, to established habitat for example of bat species known to use the area for roosting and the former sports field for feeding corridors. The latter was established during ecological surveys carried out for the abandoned planning application to develop the sports field in 2015. The former allotment area was partially cleared of vegetation more than a decade ago with a view to re-establishing the area for allotment use. It was at this time that an archaeological field walking survey was undertaken of the disturbed ground, finds from which identified potential for buried archaeological remains within the area. I don't seem to have come across a mention of this in the WNP evidence documents.

g) This area and the wildlife corridor afforded by the enclosure hedge line which bounds the allotments, the disused allotment, and the former sports field, provided access for new species to colonise and use the former sports field since its abandonment in 2015. Minimal management of the grass sward has allowed an increase in the area's biodiversity and although there is no public access, enough information can be gleaned from various viewpoints within the surrounding houses to gauge the development. Many key indicator species have arrived to use the area either as direct habitat for example as feeding

'trees in boundaries marking the former enclosure boundaries heading south from Chapel Lane'.

f) The Werrington Allotments is the only site that fulfils the criteria for Local Green Space designation in the south of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Other large open spaces are already designated.

It has already been identified that the Neighbourhood Plan area does not meet the standards for allotment provision, but any proposed allotment expansion is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is known that Ward Councillors have been reviewing options for this field.

The archaeological merit of this field has not been identified through the search of formal records. This information will be added to the History Section of the Character Assessment and 'Open Space Assessment'.

g) The information about the nature found within the field in the 'Open Space Assessment' has been updated.

	<p>nurseries for Starling fledglings or the Grass Snakes and amphibians taking advantage of the flood area in the southwest corner of the field. This is an area which remains with standing water or as waterlogged ground for much of the year and is not mown for obvious reasons.</p> <p>h) By way of a final point the long disused sports field has already been nominated for a Local Green Space with the City Council as part of the Peterborough Local Plan development. With a forward-looking appropriate management plan, the disused sports field and the former allotment areas combined could provide the framework to establish both a public access green space and a wildlife habitat of some note within the Werrington area. It is hoped that the WNC would seek an accommodation to promote this within the Natural Environment Policies laid out in the Draft Plan with the current landowners and leaseholders.</p>	<p>h) Werrington Neighbourhood Plan cannot designate this field as a Local Green Space because it does not meet the criteria. Whilst it, with its boundaries, forms an undisturbed wildlife space and corridor, its maintenance means it remains a grassy field rather than a meadow and limits its potential as an important biodiversity area for the area.</p> <p>It is noted that during the early consultation stages of the Peterborough new Local Plan the site has been identified in the 'Strategic Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment' with an indicative 64 houses. It is also noted that residents have nominated it for designation as a Local Green Space as part of the same consultation process.</p> <p>The Academy's lease and lack of access points clearly limits any future use as a community space.</p> <p>Ward Councillor's involvement regarding the future of this field with the adjoining overgrown area is also noted.</p>
<p>5: Online 29/1/24</p>	<p>Just a general suggestion for the heavy traffic using David's Lane (including many Royal Mail lorries and truckers using it as a cut through). perhaps put a ban on 7.5 tonne and upwards from using David's Lane and the village unless delivering heavy goods to addresses in area? Failing that, traffic calming with speed bumps to discourage it's use?</p>	<p>Traffic management falls outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Ward Councillors are working with Peterborough City Council to review speed restrictions. This has been noted as an ongoing community project.</p>
<p>6: Online 29/1/24</p>	<p>a) I wholeheartedly support the objectives and believe them to be well thought out and appropriate to Werrington. I support the design and development policy – especially the requirement for proposals to be appropriate in height and massing to the local area and limited to 2 storeys. I particularly support and welcome the protection of local green spaces, habitats and</p>	<p>a) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p>

	<p>footpaths and cycleways - all of these aspects set Werrington apart as a great place to live.</p> <p>b) In section 5.5 I would like to see the full extent of the Ken Stimpson playing fields (Figure B) included in the designated green dashed protected Local Green Space covered by Policy WNP7. Given the community questionnaire responses cited in 5.5.5 this would seem a common view.</p> <p>c) Overall: Thank you for all of the hard work which has clearly gone into development of the plan. Congratulations to all involved in getting the work to this stage.</p>	<p>b) See the response under Comment 2</p> <p>c) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed</p>
<p>7: Online 3/2/24</p>	<p>Don't disagree with the fencing of part of Ken Stimpson School fields but not all of it which has now been suggested.</p>	<p>See the response under Comment 2</p>
<p>8: Online 4/2/24</p>	<p>a) The green spaces of Werrington are so valued by residents and important for physical and mental health and wellbeing. I would like to see the plan go further to include protection for all Werrington Fields, at least to ensure that any fencing of the fields by the school has thoroughly considered the impact on the community and that any loss of open space is kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>b) I appreciate however that a lot of work has been done to get the plan this far.</p> <p>c) I think it's a shame that the council do not see it this way, and that WNC are afraid to try to protect Werrington's most treasured asset due to the whole plan being torpedoed by the council Overall: Save Werrington Fields!!</p>	<p>a) See the response under Comment 2</p> <p>b) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p> <p>c) Whilst Werrington Neighbourhood Council have supported the project, it is Werrington Area Forum which has undertaken the development of a Werrington Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of residents. See the response under Comment 2.</p>
<p>9: Online 4/2/24</p>	<p>a) Campaign to have a swimming pool in Werrington.</p> <p>b) Introduce 20mph traffic speed limit in Church Street</p> <p>c) Discourage parents from taking children to school in cars.</p>	<p>a) Campaigning for the swimming pool is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the importance of recreational facilities is highlighted in WNP9.</p> <p>b) Traffic management falls outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Ward Councillors are working with Peterborough City Council to review speed restrictions.</p>

		c) Cycling and walking within Werrington is encouraged through WNP10.
10: Online 15/2/24	Very detailed and well written. Honestly can't think of any improvements.	The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.
11: Online 22/2/24	<p>a) Seems well researched and a good summary of the area and key issues. All good stuff!</p> <p>b) Would have been (or still will be?) interesting to see what practical impact the WNP had/has on the proposed fencing of all or part of the Ken Stimpson playing field area, as it conflicts with several of the sections (important views, natural habitat areas, access to green spaces, leisure, and recreational use).</p> <p>c) WNP4: Parking: is all well and good for new development but doesn't seem to have any impact on existing and increasing current problems. For example, outside the fish & chip shop in Lincoln Road opposite the Jet filling station, where double yellow lines and the bus stop are routinely ignored - this will only be improved by enforcement action.</p> <p>d) Typo: WNP8 (p.48) development proposals not supported if it results in additional off-street parking on local roads - surely this should be on-street parking.</p> <p>e) p.23 of the Open Space Assessment document refers to the Goodwin Walk play area being adjacent to Cranemore - presumably the wrong street name as this is nowhere near it.</p> <p>f) Thanks for all the hard work. Good luck!</p>	<p>a) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p> <p>b) Please see the response given to Comment 2. Given the advanced nature of the planning process, WNP5, WNP6, WNP7 and WNP9 will have no effect on the outcome.</p> <p>c) The current parking problems are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan which is a matter of enforcement.</p> <p>d) The comment is correct. The mis spelling has been amended.</p> <p>e) The comment is correct. Correct Cranemore to Copsewood</p> <p>f) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p>
12: Online 22/2/24	Having lived in Werrington and used the Ken Stimpson school playing field alongside the general adjacent lovely green area with tree lined avenues since I came in 1985 I fail to see how accepting that the school playing field is to be fenced off will do anything but make the whole of this area lose its beauty and general appeal	See the response given to Comment 2

	<p>looking more like a prison I don't understand why the original agreed scheme to only fence off parts of the playing field actually needed for playing games on is not it appears going to be followed to the total detriment of this area.</p>	
<p>13: Online 25/2/24</p>	<p>This has been a mammoth undertaking by WNC which has generated a really comprehensive document detailing the current status of Werrington and its position going forward. It was great to meet with the team at the library to discuss the plan in detail. With this plan in place, I hope the character of Werrington, which we so love, will be maintained but also realising that development and changes will need to take place in the future. Thank you.</p>	<p>Whilst Werrington Neighbourhood Council have supported the project, it is Werrington Area Forum that has undertaken the Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of the community. The supportive comments are noted. No action needed</p>
<p>14: Online 26/2/24</p>	<p>Ensure Werrington fields are not fenced</p>	<p>See the response made to Comment 2</p>
<p>15: Online 26/2/24</p>	<p>a) Basic outline is sound.</p> <p>b) The vision does not appear to include improving the current built environment. Improving, repairing, and maintaining roads, pavements, cycleways, open spaces both wild and recreation. Also, the area is showing its age, and needs general renovation. On energy there are now plans to improve the Energy efficiency of the current housing stock, for example area ground source heating or solar panels. Provision for accessible housing should include conversion of upgrading current housing stock instead of new build.</p> <p>c) Car parking needs to be addressed in current areas of New Town, either by greater enforcement or permit schemes as in other areas of the city.</p> <p>d) Werrington centre is a disgrace. Again, the emphasis is on the new and not the existing built environment.</p>	<p>a) The supportive comment is noted. No action needed.</p> <p>b) Maintenance and improvement of infrastructure and private property is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Certain problems are already being addressed by Ward Councillors and/or have been identified as Community Projects</p> <p>c) Enforcement of parking regulations is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>d) Maintenance and improvement of a private property is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Ward Councillors are working with agencies to address some of the problems.</p>

	<p>e) Also, there is still a lack of good fitness facilities including a pool suitable for an aging population.</p> <p>f) Perhaps more thought given to finding funds for investment in what we have.</p>	<p>e) WNP9 supports the improvement of local recreational facilities.</p> <p>f) Funding for infrastructure development is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>
<p>16: Online 27/2/24</p>	<p>a) Key Issues may identify current issues, but later proposals only address future developments not areas with current problems.</p> <p>b) Parking in existing development needs addressing, not merely new development allocation.</p> <p>c) Wildlife may be lovely, but squirrel infestation and invasion into homes is not.</p> <p>d) It is aspirational, not practical.</p> <p>e) "A sports centre and swimming pool have been planned for the future" - this has been jam tomorrow for the last 40 years and I should like to see a firm commitment with dates and funding. Werrington needs to be updated and improved after years of neglect.</p> <p>f) Werrington has always had a dichotomy between "the village" and "the new part". While conservation of heritage is important this should not be to the detriment of the wider population</p>	<p>a) Maintenance and improvement of infrastructure and private property is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan Certain problems are already being addressed by Ward Councillors and/or have been identified as Community Projects</p> <p>b) Inconsiderate parking is an enforcement issue and outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>c) Outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>d) Comment noted.</p> <p>e) Current City Council budget restraints have stalled the swimming pool project. Maintenance and improvement of infrastructure and private property is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Certain problems are already being addressed by Ward Councillors and/or have been identified as Community Projects</p> <p>f) The Neighbourhood Plan has attached equal importance to the original village, the wider village, and the Township. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan details Werrington's heritage, there is no direct protection given through its policies although the preservation of each area's character runs throughout the Plan and applies equally to both the old and new areas. Werrington's heritage is protected through the Conservation Area Management Plan, National Heritage List for England, or the List of Heritage Assets of Peterborough.</p>

	<p>g) Parking permits for residential streets; improved street lighting on paths and better public transport to address needs of ageing population - often no direct bus route to medical services in Werrington, never mind the hospital.</p> <p>h) Community centres need to be maintained and host activities for older people during day</p>	<p>g) These issues are outside the scope of Werrington Neighbourhood Plan, but some are addressed as Community Projects.</p> <p>h) The importance of community centres has been highlighted and addressed by policy WNP9.</p>
<p>17: Online 27/2/24</p>	<p>a) Policy LP37 the proposed capacity for 100 dwellings, again this will just add to the traffic problem of excessive traffic on Staniland Way</p> <p>b) I would like to make a comment regarding Staniland Way. The road is extremely unsafe. The Werrington Neighbourhood Plan states that the residential estates which back onto the road is protected from the traffic. Two years ago, a car crashed through my garden wall (89 Crowhurst) 10 o clock on a Sunday morning. I was 30 seconds away from walking into my garden. I could have been killed or badly injured. Luckily the lady who was driving the car was not seriously injured. Staniland Way is the only road into Werrintgon centre, its services Tesco, school, sports centre, shops, doctors, dentist etc. Many drivers are treating it as a single carriage roadway travelling at excessive speeds. The only residential area that exits onto Staniland Way is Crowhurst and exiting Crowhurst has become extremely difficult due to the amount of traffic that uses Staniland Way. I do not feel safe in my own garden. I would like to repeat the fact that homes that back onto this road are NOT protected. Staniland Way is the only road that can be used to reach the Werrington Centre, this creates an excessive amount of traffic traveling in both directions going to and coming from the centre, I feel that this problem needs to be addressed by opening other routes to the centre. I would like to see speed cameras installed on Staniland Way to stop the speeding.</p>	<p>a) Peterborough Local Plan's Policy LP37 refers to 100 indicative dwellings for Werrington Centre. This is not a Neighbourhood Plan policy, but it was mentioned in WNP1. As part of the Neighbourhood Plan consultation, however, the City Council suggested that this reference is removed in view of the current review of the Local Plan and the wording of WNP1 has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>b) The comments are noted but the wording of the Character Assessment will not be changed. The speeding and traffic volumes of Staniland Way is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. These issues have been added to the Community Projects highlighted by the Neighbourhood Plan</p>

<p>18: Online 28/2/24</p>	<p>a) I would argue that most of the policies in objectives 1 and 2 also support objective 3 in making Werrington a desirable location for quality services and businesses to establish themselves, grow and attract employees. This could reduce the travel to work distances thereby contributing to the broader sustainability objectives.</p> <p>b) The indicative capacity of 100 dwellings at the Werrington Centre is established but should not be in overbearing blocks (I fully agree with comments about new builds being limited to 2 stories with pitched roofs so that they appear to be part of Werrington and contribute to its character and community not just plonked there).</p> <p>c) The schedule of trees F indicates this to be Goodwin Walk but equally appears to be the tree belt between the school and properties in Hall Lane and Shepherd Close. This is a valued resource, but I would just mention that at least one property (not mine) is affected by subsidence due to adjoining trees.</p> <p>d) 5.5.4 Ash Park was built on valued open space. Permission was granted with adjoining residents told that a play area would be constructed nearby. This never happened. I agree that any additional housing should not be at the expense of loss of green space or other amenities.</p> <p>e) I don't know whether it can be incorporated within the plan, but I would strongly urge that any development (and particularly when 100 dwellings are involved) should not be for one</p>	<p>a) Comments are noted. No action needed.</p> <p>b) See comments made in response to 17a. The comments made in support are noted and no action is needed.</p> <p>c) The substantial tree belt to the rear of Martins Court, Welbourne School and Goodwin Walk playing fields is a former footpath connecting Fenbridge Road and the village which was closed off with the development of the Village. The narrative has been extended to include this area when describing the former hedgerows, Given that this is a short narrow inaccessible area it is not considered that it should be identified as a biodiversity area. Peterborough City Council have requested a further wording to clarify the need for maintenance of trees.</p> <p>d) The lack of play areas to the northeast of Werrington has been highlighted.</p> <p>e) The areas of mixed housing and strong feeling of community has highlighted as a characteristic of Werrington. The</p>
--	---	---

particular demographic i.e. not all single people, all social housing, all private housing etc. Community is frequently mentioned as something that is valued in Werrington and should be reflected in any significant development. Having some people at home all day, some with disabilities, some families contribute to this. Quiet observance, a helping hand, taking in parcels, fetching medication, giving a lift, helping with odd jobs etc are best achieved with a good mix of people of varying skills and backgrounds.

- f) Pedantic queries: 5.7.6 roller cf rolling? 5.7.9 Is the Ploughman still to exist? Prince's Trust (apostrophe) 5.7.13 Prince's Trust (apostrophe and s). Page 52 refers to map x.
- g) Admiration for the amount of time and effort invested in this and putting forward balanced views. The value of open spaces has been highlighted with the current reduced access to Cuckoo's Hollow. Although seemingly not too badly provided for this reflects the limited resilience of the open space there is especially should something unforeseen occur as happened with Covid. It also contributes to the community feel forming common ground and a transition between old and new Werrington. It gives motivation to groups such as the Wombles to do the good work that they do because there is still something to have pride in. There is an attraction to people getting exercise which promotes better health meaning less drain on NHS and social care. If an area loses its character and pride goes even more would fall onto PCC (and the NHS) to resolve. Overall, just because Werrington does relatively well in various metrics compared to other parts of Peterborough does not mean that things should be allowed to slide such that the whole of Peterborough is reduced to the lowest common denominator. Without areas such as Werrington there will be even less to attract skilled people and businesses to the city.

Neighbourhood Plan emphasises the strong community feel of Werrington.

- f) The amendments have been noted and all have been changed.
- g) The supportive comments and general remarks about the benefits of living in Werrington have been noted. No action needed.

<p>19: Form</p>	<p>a) Concerned about the fencing of Ken Stimpson Field but suspect this is not within your control.</p> <p>b) Not adverse in principle to residential building at Werrington Centre as long as in keeping with existing architecture/sufficient car parking.</p>	<p>a) The response about the fields adjacent to Ken Stimpson Academy can be seen under comment 2.</p> <p>b) The Neighbourhood Plan will be used to make comment during the consultation in the advent of any future Planning Application for this privately owned site.</p>
<p>20: Form</p>	<p>Well, thought out</p>	<p>The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p>
<p>21: Form</p>	<p>a) Well-presented Plan</p> <p>b) Basically, not happy with the fencing in the playing field. Feel it should be designed as public open space parkland with facilities – planting, picnic area etc.</p> <p>c) The Public Open Space at the shopping centre Tesco's looks scruffy, unwelcoming, dirty. This could be so very nice, if looked after. Obviously, there is evidence that the 'faux turf' has been laid at some point, but badly damaged. Also, any planting that existed has been removed. Surely at some point it has come to the notice of the local Council. In this day and age, there should be some CCTV in the area, as with the degradation comes unreasonable behaviour, consequently discouraging the general public from using the area. It could be so nice – a restful area with benches and space where working people in the area could relax with their picnic lunches etc I understand that the coffee shop within the complex is no longer able to take advantage of the covered seating area enjoyed by so many people, giving the area a nice safe feeling, thus discouraging other influences. The reason being that the owner of the overhang refuses to do necessary repairs to the ceiling even though it has become a public hazard. Surely this should be able to be enforced. Would a signed petition carry some weight? If private enterprise, landlords etc become stronger than the Council, this is wrong on all levels.</p>	<p>a) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p> <p>b) The response about the fields adjacent to Ken Stimpson Academy can be seen under comment 2.</p> <p>c) Maintenance and improvement of private property such as Werrington Centre is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Certain problems though are already being addressed by the MP, Ward Councillors and/or City Council Officers. No action needed.</p>

<p>22: Email 24/2/24</p>	<p>Thank you so much for your email. I did have a look through but, cutting to the chase, is there any building development planned for the other part of the playing field that Brookside is built on in PE4? Sorry, I appreciate all that you're obviously doing for us as residents but, just at the moment and I know it's selfish of me, I'm currently most concerned about what could happen there. Thank you again for everything you're doing.</p>	<p>Building development plans are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Brookside/Fulbridge Road former sports field has been identified as a potential development site in the 'Strategic Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment' with an indicative 64 houses in the initial stages of the new Local Plan. The Werrington Neighbourhood Plan has not identified this area as a Local Green Space as the site is considered not to fulfil the criteria needed for the designation. Policy WNP8 gives reflects the issues for any potential development of the site. No amendment needed to Plan.</p>
<p>23: Email 24/2/24</p>	<p>a) Well, done to all who have spent many, many hours preparing these documents in such detail. Some of these are possibly thoughts/ideas, rather than comments, which may not fit directly with the document.</p> <p>b) Reading that Werrington has an aging population there is no mention of facilities for mobility scooters. - when users visit e.g. shops, library, sports facilities, dentists, doctors, community centres -nor in new build especially on level access. This would include safe/ covered parking & charging.</p> <p>c) There is a wonderful tree lined path/cycle way starting uphill from David's Lane underpass up to William Law School. This is a major route for pedestrians, mobility scooters, cycles, scooters to get to school however it is far too narrow. E.g. the path along Hodgson Ave/Twelvetree Ave, requiring the crossing of many roads and bumpier (due to tree roots), is much wider. Signage. There are some blue/white signs on posts denoting walk/cycle ways. The old, useful, white painted signage of a pedestrian/bicycle/give way markings/dividing line down the path, has largely worn off & not been replaced.</p>	<p>a) The supportive comments are noted. No action needed.</p> <p>b) WNP10 Footpaths and cycleways was originally written with mobility scooters accessibility in mind. Paragraph 5.8.6 and the policy has had extra detail added to it</p> <p>WNP4 Parking also has extra detail added to reflect this use.</p> <p>c) Maintenance of cycleways is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Ward Councillors have been working with Highways to refresh some of the road markings and ruts, so this has been noted as a Community Project.</p>

	<p>d) Community Centres. I'm pleased to see the report does mention the need to try to retain these. Besides being available for ALL ages, they could be increasing used by Werrington's aging population for wellbeing e.g. coffee mornings/afternoons, meal clubs, suitable exercise classes, talks, etc.</p> <p>e) Green Spaces. Pleased that you mention the importance of keeping these, tree belts-especially useful for wildlife, stopping noise & pollution, also large back gardens as spaces/wildlife corridors. Please can we keep the open spaces as that & not have them fenced off as proposed at Ken Stimpson School.</p>	<p>d) The importance of community centres is highlighted in WNP9.</p> <p>e) A review of all the open spaces has been undertaken and Policy WNP7 has identified the most important ones as designated Local Green Spaces. In relation to the fields adjoining Ken Stimpson Academy see the response to Comment 2</p>
<p>24: Email 29/2/24</p>	<p>a) We have not found the time to review the plan in full. However, we have followed its development so please accept our thanks and congratulations for putting together such a comprehensive document. We have only two comments that may or may not be appropriate:</p> <p>b) The appalling state of the Werrington Centre does not seem to be a key issue which in my view it should be. The state of the Centre has gone downhill over the past 20 years.</p> <p>c) Secondly the part of the plan that covers open spaces/recreational facilities would have to be reviewed if the total fencing of the Werrington Field goes ahead without a compromise being agreed. I have no problem if you think these comments are inappropriate and ignored.</p>	<p>a) The supportive comments are noted.</p> <p>b) The Character Assessment reflects the deterioration of Werrington Centre but as this is privately owned it is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Local Councillors, MP and City Council are working to influence improvements there.</p> <p>c) WNP7 Designated Local Green Spaces will not need to be reviewed as the proposed area being fenced will outside any area being designated</p>
<p>25: Letter</p>	<p>a) The more I read the Werrington Neighbourhood Plan the more I became confused. Yes, I strongly agree we all must play our part in protecting our environment so plants, animals and wilds can thrive alongside us humans. What I don't understand is this, if anyone want to build a dwelling at the bottom of one's gardens it is to be met with a huge amount of disapproval. As</p>	<p>a) Peterborough Local Plan's Policy LP37 refers to 100 indicative dwellings for Werrington Centre. This is not a Neighbourhood Plan policy, but it was mentioned in WNP1. As part of the Neighbourhood Plan consultation, however, the City Council suggested that this reference is removed in view of the current</p>

you say it will have an adverse effect in all of our local wildlife. Yet it is more than acceptable to build 100 homes. Is that not being hypocritical and having double standards? I am aware these dwellings are supposed to be built on brown sites, surely causing far more problems and harm to the very things that need protecting. Perhaps its down to the fact that money is involved. After all someone is going to profit from their investments, and it will not be the wildlife. No profit for the big guns when dwellings is built at the bottom of one's garden.

- b) With extra housing comes litter/rubbish being dumped everywhere! Endangering all wildlife as a whole. More pollution caused by all sorts of vehicles. Yes, I am very concerned for our wildlife especially as animals can and do get trapped in discarded rubbish. I can also rat population increasing due to uneaten food being thrown down just anywhere.
- c) Road congestion will become more of an issue. Even now roads around and near Ken Stimpson are already grid located at certain times of the day. Extra traffic will only add to more air pollution and more havoc on the roads a right nightmare.
- d) With a possibility of an extra 500 people coming into the area, how can the over stretched amenities accommodate them! With no NHS dentist's difficulty getting a GP appointment not to mention school places! The local thriving public houses is ear marked for closure. Yet more houses must be built draining our resources. We don't have much of them as it is!
- e) As for the habitat of our local wildlife and their right of freedom to roam. It has not been taken into account, when thousands upon thousands of pounds is to be spent on fencing off fields adjacent to the Ken Stimpson School. I believe public land was used to extend that school several years earlier. Now yet more land is to be denied to the public and to our beloved wildlife. So can I take it that in this instance wildlife takes second

review of the Local Plan and the wording of WNP1 has been amended accordingly.

- b) This is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan
- c) Road congestion is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but encouragement is given to walking and cycling in WNP10.
- d) There is no proposal within the Neighbourhood Plan to bring 500 people into the area. Local NHS provision, school places and closure of facilities is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- e) The Neighbourhood Plan supports open spaces and natural habitats especially through WNP6 and WNP7. The fencing of the fields adjacent to Ken Stimpson Academy is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. See the response to Comment 2.

	<p>place. Who's going to pray for its erection and maintenance with all the Council cutbacks on their agenda. Thought there was no money in its coffers. May I also point out the school only uses these playing fields 195 days a year weather permitting so approximately 6 months of each year is doubtful.</p> <p>f) Finally, I make no apology for my negativity as I cannot see how our wildlife can be protected against some 500 people descending into such a small area. Not all humans care about protecting our wildlife. I wonder if the Plans you intend to submit will amount to anything. Again, I have my doubts, only time will tell by then it will be too late. Maybe history repeating itself once again. As seen and shown in other parts of the country. I have spent several sleepless nights over the week trying to write the enclosed letter. It has been so very difficult, but I felt compelled to put pen to paper on such serious issues as these my only hope is that you will not pass my letter off as if my words are from a rant raving lunatic as I have never been so sincere about anything as important as this in my 70 years on this beloved earth of ours. I am so sorry to say whatever I or anyone else thinks of the Werrington Neighbourhood Plan. It will count for very little in the end. Hence, I haven't mentioned anything about it in this letter! Thank you for taking time to read my letter.</p>	<p>f) Comments noted. No action needed.</p>
<p>26: Letter 29/2/24</p>	<p>a) As per the compiled information regarding Werrington Neighbourhood Plan by the local volunteers, the area is rightfully described as thriving, settles, low crime rate community with a mix of houses/bungalows. It is in my view, a model that could and should be replicated in many towns across the country. We have thoughtfully laid out green area with trees and shrubs, and pathways which encourage many residents to walk their dogs, or simply to get out in the fresh air to enhance a feeling of wellbeing. Development to date has been planned to a standard that put people first, without creating ghettos of tightly packed minimal spaced low cast houses, with narrow roads and parking</p>	<p>a) Comments noted. No action needed.</p>

inconvenience. The community of Werrington chose to live here because it caters for a variety of ages, income levels, housing styles and has a cohesive safe feeling about it.

- b) A previous attempt a couple of years ago to develop the Werrington Centre area to low-cost high-density accommodation was rejected overwhelmingly by residents. The attempt at such development is driven entirely by those who seek maximum profits without any regard whatsoever to detrimental effects on the community already established.
- c) The present proposal for development of up to 100 houses with allocated space for cycle parking is entirely without merit and ignites the practicality of needing to travel to get to work or simply because people value the independence of being able to go where they want, when they want without having to rely on the present exceptionally poor and inconvenient public transport system. Werrington neighbourhood cannot accommodate such a stupid plan and the idea that any houses need a cycle parking space is ludicrous. Those who came up with such a plan are seemingly over influenced by the 'climate crises hoax'. People here use cars and need cars either for work or leisure.
- d) Any proposal to build single occupancy houses, or houses that would accommodate up to two people, would be entirely inappropriate, as they would not be suitable for those who wanted to start a family or invest their time and energy in maintaining or creating a cohesive community. There seems to be no thought given to the impact on the lives of those already here, the surrounding areas that support wildlife and bird will be destroyed by the impact of more people, the loss of habitat, not to mention the stress on the infrastructure of water, sewage, and access to the properties.

b) Werrington Centre and the area adjacent to it is privately owned. Any development of this site falls outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan

c) The recent planning application for the area adjacent to Werrington Centre comprised of a 72 bedroomed care home and 8 flats, with parking for 35 cars and 6 cycles. The Neighbourhood Plan reflects the need for cars within Werrington by making provision for better car parking standards whilst encouraging more sustainable forms of transport. There is no suggestion within these two sources that cars will be eliminated from Werrington. Given that Werrington is relatively flat, has excellent cycleways and already has a large population of cyclists, it is considered that the provision of good quality cycle ways and cycle parking is an important feature of future developments, and this is reflected in WNP4 and WNP10. No action needed.

d) The Neighbourhood Plan is not suggesting there will be any future large-scale development but provides a planning framework for any future development there might be. It encourages the provision of a range of residential development but highlights a rapidly aging population requiring low-cost accessible accommodation. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the wildlife of Werrington through WNP6 and 7. The infrastructure is outside the scope of the Plan.

	<p>With a massively falling birthrate, which is affecting every country in the world there will be reduction in the number of children enrolling at local schools, which in turn will eventually result in fewer people to buy houses, thereby turning Werrington into a deteriorating environment. The mix of houses we already have provide for any and all housing requirements. As the present generation pass away or move to sheltered housing, over the next few years, the availability of houses should meet what will be a reducing demand. The idea to build any such development. Against the wishes of the people already here is just another example that the 'faceless planners' have forgotten they work for us the people. Anyone, either elected or working for government or local councils is there to serve the people, a fact seemingly forgotten by them. I object strongly to any further development of Werrington Neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has been written by local residents to help maintain the character of Werrington in the event of future development.</p>
<p>27: Email 18/1/24</p>	<p>I had a quick peak at the Werrington plan whilst enjoying a pint in the Frothblowers yesterday. The thing that caught my eye the most was the parking plan. We live in Werrington Village where you will know parking is a huge problem, but what concerned me about the plan was that it seems to address any future developments, not current issues. Where we live on Church Street (we are in one of the cottages near the dentist/doctors) there is hard standing at the front of the row of houses for people to park. There are three of us who do not have driveways and have to take potluck on a daily basis to park outside. An example of the difficulty is that I drove round for three quarters of an hour with a car load of shopping and couldn't find anywhere on Church Street to park. There is ample parking for people who use the chemist, dentist, or doctors at the rear, but it seems a lot take the easy option of parking outside our houses. Do you think the Council would sanction Residents Only parking if enough people agreed to it? Perhaps you could give it some thought please. It is good that parking is being considered when planning future developments, but there are a lot of existing problems around parking that also need addressing.</p>	<p>Addressing the current parking problems is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Such issues have been highlighted as a Community Project and these specific comments have been passed to Ward Councillors.</p> <p>Parking issues in future developments are addressed by WNP4 and encouragement is given to walking and cycling in WNP10.</p>

PART THREE: RESPONSES MADE FROM OTHER STATUTORY CONSULTTEES

1. From Peterborough City Council: Email dated 29th Feb 2024: Werrington Neighbourhood Plan, Pre-Submission Consultation Version- Regulation 14 PCC Comments

Comments	Response
<p>Basic Conditions: Peterborough City Council considers that the Regulation 14 Werrington Neighbourhood Plan, in its current form, meets the Basic Conditions, here are some minor comments below: Peterborough City Council is happy to work with Werrington Neighbourhood Forum in redrafting the parts of the policies where any issues in the table below lie, and/or is happy to review and comment on draft wording informally prior to formal submission of the neighbourhood plan to Peterborough City Council.</p>	<p>Basic Conditions: Comment noted. No action needed</p>
<p>Legal requirements: Peterborough City Council confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Werrington Area Forum is a qualifying body • The Werrington Neighbourhood Area Forum was formally designated on 2 November 2023 • The WNP does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area • There are no other neighbourhood plans in place within the Werrington neighbourhood area. 	<p>Legal Requirements: Comment noted. No action needed.</p>
<p>WNP1: Spatial Strategy A suggestion to not refer to LP37, as it might become a different policy number under the Local Plan review. Although, this Neighbourhood Plan would need to refer to the existing adopted Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>WNP1: Remove the sentence referring to LP37. First paragraph now states: Development proposals which enhance the vibrancy, vitality and sustainability of Werrington will be supported in principle, subject to being in accordance with the Peterborough Local Plan. Paragraph 5.1.2 referring to LP37 remains in the policy.</p>
<p>WNP2: High Quality Design No further comments to make.</p>	<p>WNP2: Comment noted. No action needed.</p>
<p>WNP3: Sustainable construction and energy efficiency Reference to policy LP31 would be useful here.</p>	<p>WNP3: Paragraph 5.1.10 changed to include reference to LP31</p>
<p>WNP4: Car Parking: No further comments to make.</p>	<p>WNP4: Comment noted. No action needed.</p>

<p>WNP5: Locally Important Views The council support their management to perpetuate these important landscape features yet ask that policy TP29 and TP30 of the Council's Trees and Woodland Strategy (see Schedule 1 below) are acknowledged, in respect to the need manage these assets in respect to their future growth potential, threats from pest and disease and property subsidence.</p>	<p>WNP5: Paragraph 5.3.5 added to reflect this comment</p>
<p>WNP6: Natural Habitats</p> <p>a) <i>“Development proposals should demonstrate that they comply with the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as established by the Environment Act 2021”</i>- Technically this is already a statutory duty anyway. If Werrington wishes to put a policy in place that goes above and beyond the existing statutory duty this would be the place to do it. Examples could include putting policies in place that require specific habitats to be used as onsite compensation, identifying areas which would be preferred for BNG provision or requiring specific designs of green space (for example all at the edges of developments or equally spaced through the development Etc.)</p> <p>b) <i>“Biodiversity Value”</i>- Dangerous term as within the BNG metric almost all habitats have “value”. Recommend replacing this with <i>“expected to retain features of moderate distinctiveness as described within the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain Metric”</i>. Then this will cover wildflower meadows and woods etc.</p> <p>c) Where is <i>“Map X”</i>?</p> <p>d) *Add in bold*- Development proposals should, wherever possible, seek to enhance connectivity of green networks through the inclusion of strong landscaping schemes that include native trees, native shrubs, species rich hedgerows, green roofs, and green walls and avoid the loss of trees within residential curtilages or within streets. There will be a presumption that the Habitats and Green Infrastructure as described within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy will be implemented as described (To be published in Winter 2024).</p> <p>e) <i>“Development proposals which would cause the loss or harm to wildlife habitats, features of biodiversity and natural features such as trees, woodlands, hedgerows, watercourses or ponds will not be permitted unless the need for and benefits of the development outweigh any adverse impacts and where similar replacement habitats are provided as part of the proposal that will result in at least a neutral impact on biodiversity.”</i> - This section is a little in</p>	<p>a) After consideration it is thought that there aren't enough strong examples to support any extension of this policy. PCC confirms it can be backed up in the Local Plan on a wider scale.</p> <p>b) This has been corrected.</p> <p>c) This has been corrected to Figure 21</p> <p>d) This has been added.</p> <p>e) After due consideration the opportunity has been taken to draw together the features of Fox Covert. Sobrite Spring and the Newt Ponds as a wider landscape. The connectivity</p>

conflict with the Biodiversity Net Gain legislation which requires a net positive impact on biodiversity. This could be a suitable place to insert some words targeting specific species and habitats which are significant to Werrington, which benefits created for would be particularly sought after.

f) *“Development proposals should provide at least a 10% net biodiversity gain in line with the applicable legislative requirements.”*- This is an opportunity to request more than 10% should be aspirational. Or that any off-site units should be purchased where possible to aid in the creation of Werrington green space.

g) ~~*The net gain for biodiversity should be calculated using Natural England’s Biodiversity Metric.*~~ (Remove as this is a statutory requirement).

h) Schedule 1: Schedule of Notable Trees

The council acknowledge the aspiration to retain and preserve tree avenues within Werrington. The council support their management to perpetuate these important landscape features, yet ask that policy TP29 and TP30 of the Council's [Trees and Woodland Strategy](#) (see extract below) are acknowledged, in respect to the need manage these assets in respect to their future growth potential, threats from pest and disease and property subsidence. This may lead to some changes in respect to the tree’s species diversity, or the need for more significant pruning in the coming years.

“Avenues and other Arboricultural Features

Policy TP29: To maintain formal arboricultural features in the urban landscape by careful management and timely renewal as required.

Priorities:

TP29.1 To consider the long-term development and safe life expectancy of mature avenues and instigate a policy of gradual renewal and replacement in advance of them becoming untenable. Measures could include pruning, total removal and replacement, partial removal, and replacement.

Policy TP30: To take action to restructure avenue trees planted with inappropriate species too close to neighbouring properties.

Priorities:

of hedgerows and woodlands linking the old Village to the new Township

f) After review it is not considered that there is a need for more than 10% nbg. But reference added to reflect off-site units to aid the creation of Werrington Green Space

g) Line removed.

h) This reference has been added as paragraph 5.4.7

<p>TP30.1: In areas where avenue trees pose a potential threat to adjoining buildings, the council will manage or restructure the avenues to minimise the impact on the properties. Options will include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Removing avenue trees and replacing with low water demand species. – Removing avenue trees adjoining buildings and filling the gaps with smaller low water demand species. As far as possible maintaining regular spacing and the avenue effect. – For suitable species such as lime and London plane reduce the crown or pollard to reduce water uptake. This will only reduce water demand if the trees are pruned on short and regular cycle of no more than three years.” <p>i) <i>“Development proposals on a Local Green Space will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances, in line with national policy.”</i>- Inserting a reference here to the Natural England Green Space Deprivation map may be useful to direct the creation of green space. https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Map.aspx</p>	<p>Detailed consideration has been given to Natural England’s Mapping. The open spaces of the Area have different designations. As these designations, with their buffer zones, are not available on one map, a true picture of any green space deprivation cannot be generated. Peterborough City Council has also referred to the on-line public mapping showing the buffer zones based on ANGST Standards and to the PE16 Open Space Strategy. Those documents do not produce any relevant evidence either. The Plan does not make any specific reference to distances between the open spaces and more specifically in relation to Local Green Spaces, so given the difficulties with the mapping, it has been decided not to use any of this mapping as evidence.</p>
<p>WNP7: Local Green Spaces The council are happy to support the proposed Local Green Spaces.</p>	<p>WNP7: Comment noted. No action needed</p>
<p>WNP8: Former Sports Ground, Fulbridge Road This policy addresses and backs the existing amenity provision policy LP17 and these are considerations which a Planning Officer would have to consider if an application was to come forward. Therefore, the policy reiterates and supports the existing amenity provision LP17, by relating to the former sports ground on Fulbridge Road.</p>	<p>WNP8: Comment noted. No action needed.</p>

<p>WNP9: Recreational Facilities</p> <p>a) Reference to Appendix D in the Local Plan- refer to standards that have derived from local data and testing. These state 200m for LAPs, 450m for LEAPs and 800m for NEAPs.</p> <p>b) Refers to “Map X” still.</p>	<p>WNP9</p> <p>a) LAP information added.</p> <p>b) This error had already been identified and now corrected.</p>
<p>WNP10: Footpaths And Cycleways</p> <p>Figure 27- It would be useful to have a key for the coloured lines on the map. Do the existing footpaths relate to the public right of way?</p>	<p>WNP10: New key added. Total review made of the terminology used and corrections made</p>
<p>WNP11 Business Transport statement required where development of 5-80 dwellings.</p>	<p>WNP11: After consideration it has been decided this reference is not needed</p>
<p>All Ensure all paragraphs are numbered in numerical order (Spatial Strategy section)</p>	<p>All: Para 5.1.10 changed with correct numbering A consistency to the reference to Peterborough Local Plan Policies has been introduced.</p>

2. Landowner Milton Estates: Letter dated 7th Feb 2024

Comments	Response
<p>Regarding the draft Werrington Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Statutory Consultation, thank you for providing us with a letter asking for our comments. We have looked at the Werrington draft Neighbourhood Plan and can confirm that we have no concerns from Milton Estate with regards to your Plans. Kind regards Yours sincerely Abigail Benson, The Agent Milton</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed.</p>

3. Natural England: Email dated 28th February 2024

Comments	Response
<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 17 January 2024. 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. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed.</p>

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information. Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species . Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice. We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Sally Wintle Consultations Team

Full Letter can be seen in Part 4.

4. Response from Environment Agency: Email dated 26th February 2024

Comments	Response
<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Werrington Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 14 statutory consultation). We would like to draw your attention to the following comments.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed</p>
<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>a) Werrington has two main rivers: Werrington Brook and Marholm Drain. Both watercourses have associated floodplains with Flood Zone 3 and 2, extending into some of the built development. The flood risk areas have not been identified in the document.</p> <p>b) We note that throughout the Neighbourhood Plan, Werrington Brook is recognised, however Marholm Drain, which is at the southern boundary of the neighbourhood, is not referred to at any point. We would encourage the recognition of both watercourses and the associated flood risk in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>c) There is no guarantee that land in Flood Zone 2 or 3 will not be considered for development. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 165-171, we remind you that the Sequential and/or Exception Test should be undertaken if the Plan is proposing development or promoting growth, to ensure that development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. The application of the Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). It is important that the Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with any proposed development can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward. Without this understanding the Plan is unlikely to be compliant with the NPPF.</p>	<p>a) Information about the flood risk areas have been added to 2.3.1. As the Plan has no policies referring to flood risk nor development of these areas it has been decided not to add any more information about flooding.</p> <p>b) The name of this brook has been corrected across the Plan.</p> <p>c) A new 2nd paragraph has been added to Chapter5, Objective One referring to sequential and/or exception tests (and detailed below). The Plan is not proposing development nor promoting growth. This information is outside the scope of the Plan, available elsewhere and has not been consulted on. It has therefore been decided not to add any more information.</p> <p>New paragraph: It is noted that development proposals should also take due regard of requirements and guidance issued by agencies including Environment Agency and Anglian Water on matters such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequential and/or exception testing in relation to flood risk • Groundwater quality and protection including waste management. discharge of liquid effluents, land contamination, ground source heat pumps, cemetery developments, drainage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land affected by contamination • Piling • Foul drainage/wastewater Infrastructure including reference to the Water Framework Directive
<p>Groundwater Quality</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 180 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 189).</p> <p>With this in mind, we would recommend the inclusion of the following text, as supporting information in relation to groundwater quality: The WNP area mainly lies over geology classified as a secondary A aquifer. These aquifers can support local abstractions and baseflow to streams and rivers. The use (or potential use) of groundwater in the area makes parts of the area vulnerable to pollution from certain types of development.</p> <p>Best practice to ensure groundwater is protected from pollution and as a resource is contained within guidance document 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-positionstatements. This publication sets out our position for a wide range of activities and developments, including: Waste management, Discharge of liquid effluents, Land contamination, Ground source heat pumps, Cemetery developments, Drainage</p> <p>Land affected by contamination may pose risk to human health, groundwater, surface waters and the wider environment. We recommend that developers should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Follow the risk management framework provided in https://www.gov.uk/guidance/land-contamination-how-to-manage-the-risks, when dealing with land affected by contamination. – Refer to our https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/land-contaminationtechnical-guidance for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site - the local authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 	<p>The recommended text added as a new paragraph 2.3.2</p> <p>Other references to groundwater have been added to the new 2nd paragraph of Objective One. The Plan is not proposing development nor promoting growth. This information is outside the scope of the Plan, available elsewhere and has not been consulted on. It has therefore been decided not to add any more information.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consider using the http://www.claire.co.uk/projects-and-initiatives/nqms which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed. – Refer to the https://www.gov.uk/contaminated-land pages on gov.uk for more information. 	
<p>Piling Piling or any other foundation designs / investigation boreholes / tunnel shafts / ground source heating and cooling systems using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus, it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater.</p>	<p>This reference to piling has been added forming the new 2nd paragraph of Chapter 5, Objective One. The Plan is not proposing development nor promoting growth. This information is outside the scope of the Plan, available elsewhere and has not been consulted on. It has therefore been decided not to add any more information.</p>
<p>Water efficiency Peterborough lies within the East Midlands area of serious water stress where drought is a cause for concern. In view of this, we welcome Policy WNP3 (Sustainable Construction & Energy Efficiency) which acknowledges the inclusion of water efficiency matters in the Sustainability Statement. However, we would encourage including in this Policy a reference to all new dwellings should achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres per day for water efficiency, as described by Building Regulation G2. This is in line with policy LP32 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan.</p>	<p>WNP3 was reviewed in the light of these comments but the detail was not considered necessary in the light of LP32.</p>
<p>Biodiversity We welcome the inclusion of Policy WNP6 (Natural Habitats), in particular the acknowledgement that proposals should aim provide at least 10% biodiversity net gain, which is a requirement of the NPPF. We support that the plan has included the Werrington Brook and its associated green space in the proposed policies, in particular Policy WNP6 (Natural Habitats) which aims to protect and enhance it. This Policy also identifies Werrington Paddocks and Wildflower Meadow area which we note will contribute to protect and enhance parts of Marholm Brook.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. No action needed.</p>
<p>Foul Drainage/Wastewater Infrastructure Whilst there are no current concerns in relation to foul drainage capacity at Water Recycling Centres in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, we are aware that these situations can change</p>	<p>Reference to foul drainage has been added the new 2nd paragraph in Objective One. The Plan is</p>

<p>especially as the Plan is to cover a timescale up to 2036, therefore we would recommend that early consultation with Anglian Water Services is encouraged for developers. This is to determine whether there is (or will be prior to occupation) sufficient infrastructure capacity existing for the connection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of quantity and quality of water associated with any proposed development within environmental limits of the receiving watercourse.</p> <p>In addition, consideration to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) is advised in the Neighbourhood Plan, this would be beneficial in aiding enhancement of the environment. It is recommended that extracts of the above information are included and used as background information to inform the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>not proposing development nor promoting growth. This information is outside the scope of the Plan, available elsewhere and has not been consulted on. It has therefore been decided not to add any more information.</p>
<p>We would like to be notified by the Local Planning Authority of the decision on the Neighbourhood Plan under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Should you require any additional information, or wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below.</p> <p>Yours sincerely. Miss Emily Fisher Planning Advisor Full letter is in Part Four.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed</p>

5. Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission

Comments	Response
<p>Email in response dated 14th February 2024</p> <p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment upon the ongoing Draft Werrington Neighbourhood Plan (Reg 14) consultation. We welcome the production of this plan but do not consider it necessary to be involved in the detailed development of your plan at present. Please find attached our response for your records which also contains Historic England's advice and guidance for incorporating the historic environment into your plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, Ross McGivern, Historic Places Adviser, East of England Region</p>	<p>Comments and guidance noted. No action needed</p>

6. Anglian Water

Comments	Response
<p>Email Comment: Email 29th February 2024 Thank you for inviting comments on the Werrington Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission (Reg 14) consultation. Anglian Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the neighbourhood plan area and is identified as a consultation body under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Anglian Water wants to proactively engage with the neighbourhood plan process to ensure the plan delivers sustainable development for residents and visitors to the area, and in doing so protect the environment and water resources. The comments and observations for the Neighbourhood Plan, are as follows:</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed</p>
<p><u>POLICY WNP3: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY</u></p> <p>a) As a region identified as seriously water stressed, we encourage plans to include measures to improve water efficiency of new development through water efficient fixtures and fittings, including through rainwater/storm water harvesting and reuse, and greywater recycling. We support the policy requirement for a Sustainability Statement to address how new development can demonstrate water efficiency.</p> <p>b) We would suggest that the policy is strengthened as proposed below, including reference to using sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water run-off and flood risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the adaptability and resilience of the proposed buildings and associated spaces as climate change continues to change, including: reducing overheating, more ambitious measures to use water more efficiently (water efficient fixtures and fittings combined with rainwater harvesting and reuse / greywater recycling), and minimising surface water run-off through sustainable drainage systems. <p>c) The supporting text could also reference the need to follow the sustainable drainage hierarchy so that multi-functional benefits can be achieved by utilising natural above ground systems such as swales and attenuation basins, which would reinforce the aims of other policies in the plan.</p> <p>d) We are in the process of developing a Joint Protocol with Cambridge Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England to help support local planning authorities to introduce more ambitious water efficiency measures than 110 litres/person/day. Our revised draft water resources management plan for 2025-2050 identifies key challenges of population growth, climate change, and the need to protect sensitive environments by reducing abstraction. Managing the demand for water is therefore an important aspect of maintaining future supplies. The Defra Integrated Plan for Water supports the need to improve water efficiency</p>	<p>a) Supportive comments noted. No action needed/</p> <p>b) WNP3 has been rewritten to include this reference.</p> <p>c) This is beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>d) Comments noted. No action needed</p>

<p>and the Government's Environment Improvement Plan sets ten actions in the Roadmap to Water Efficiency in new developments including consideration of a new standard for new homes in England of 100 litres per person per day (l/p/d) where there is a clear local need, such as in areas of serious water stress.</p>	
<p><u>POLICY WNP6: NATURAL HABITATS</u> Anglian Water supports the policy and prioritising the delivery of biodiversity net gains within the neighbourhood planning area to support habitat recovery and enhancements within existing green infrastructure. We would also support opportunities to maximise green infrastructure connectivity including through opportunities to minimise surface water run-off from existing urban areas through the creation of raingardens for example. As the neighbourhood plan progresses, there may also be benefit in referencing the emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Nature Recovery Strategy, which will identify priority actions for nature and map specific areas for improving habitats for nature recovery.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>5.4.2 has been extended to include the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.</p>
<p><u>POLICY WNP7: LOCAL GREEN SPACES</u> Anglian Water notes the proposed local green spaces, and we agree the policy provides scope for Anglian Water to undertake operational development to maintain and repair any underground network assets that may be within these areas, such as mains water and sewer pipes, which would be consistent with national Green Belt policy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed</p>
<p>Overall, we are supportive of the policy ambitions within the Neighbourhood Plan and wish the Werrington Area Forum every success in taking this forward.</p> <p>Kind regards, Tessa Saunders MRTPI Spatial and Strategic Planning Manager – Sustainable Growth Quality & Environment</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed</p>

7. Werrington Allotment Association: Email 25th Feb 2024

Comments	Response
<p>I am on the Committee of Werrington Allotments Association and currently act as Secretary while we are waiting for the AGM. Not sure where to send my comments or if they are relevant as quite minor when looking at the document as a whole: On page 42 there is reference to “Werrington Garden Allotment”. This is very irritating, the word allotment refers to one plot and we have not (in the records I have) ever been called by this title, particularly the use of the word “Garden”. We are “Werrington Allotments” although the Council often still refers to us as “Fulbridge Road Allotments”.</p> <p>From page 44 to 47, we are referred to as “Werrington Allotment Gardens” (different to page 42). Again, my comment is that we are not “Gardens” our plots are just allotments, for the cultivation of vegetables and fruit to feed our families. As a member of the Werrington Allotments Association, I would ask that our title is corrected and that it is consistent in the document, which at the moment it isn't.</p> <p>I will be asking the members of the Committee and general members of the Association to look at these pages and see if they have any other concerns or comments. Thank you for considering the above and please pass on our thanks to all who have worked hard on this document.</p>	<p>The name 'Allotment Gardens' was taken from local maps and the City Council website. The plan is now amended to reflect name correction</p>

8. Werrington Neighbourhood Council: Email response 27th February 2024

Comments	Response
<p>Given the absence of a Parish Council Werrington Neighbourhood Council has long been recognised as a planning consultee to Peterborough City Council representing residents' views on planning matters. As such we very much welcome the production of a Werrington Neighbourhood Plan by the Werrington Neighbourhood Forum. We believe it represents a true and fair reflection of the views of the inhabitants of Werrington. There is a strong sense of community in the area and many aspects of its character are much loved locally. This plan clearly recognises the features that make the area special and provides sensible, well thought and researched guidance for any future changes or developments. It will therefore provide important extra protection for the key features of locality and will help ensure that this identity is protected for the benefit of current and future generations.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No action needed</p>

PART FOUR: SELECTED LETTERS FROM CONSULTEES:

1. RESPONSE FROM PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL
 (The response to this letter can be seen in Part Three above)



**Werrington Neighbourhood Plan, Pre-Submission Consultation Version-
 Regulation 14 PCC Comments**

Peterborough City Council wishes to make the following comments on the Regulation 14 Werrington Neighbourhood Plan.

Basic Conditions

Peterborough City Council considers that the Regulation 14 Werrington Neighbourhood Plan, in its current form, meets the Basic Conditions, here are some minor comments below:

Peterborough City Council is happy to work with Werrington Neighbourhood Forum in redrafting the parts of the policies where any issues in the table below lie, and/or is happy to review and comment on draft wording informally prior to formal submission of the neighbourhood plan to Peterborough City Council.

Legal requirements

Peterborough City Council confirm the following:

- Werrington Area Forum is a qualifying body
- The Werrington Neighbourhood Area Forum was formally designated on 2 November 2023
- The WNP does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area
- There are no other neighbourhood plans in place within the Werrington neighbourhood area.

Comment ref	Plan section / policy / para	Comment
Policy comments		
1	WNP1: Spatial Strategy	A suggestion to not refer to LP37, as it might become a different policy number under the Local Plan review. Although, this Neighbourhood Plan would need to refer to the existing adopted Local Plan policies.
2	WNP2: High Quality Design	No further comments to make.
3	WNP3: Sustainable construction and energy efficiency	Reference to policy LP31 would be useful here.

4	WNP4: Car Parking	No further comments to make.
5	WNP5: Locally Important Views	The council support their management to perpetuate these important landscape features, yet ask that policy TP29 and TP30 of the Council's Trees and Woodland Strategy (see Schedule 1 below) are acknowledged, in respect to the need manage these assets in respect to their future growth potential, threats from pest and disease and property subsidence.
6	WNP6: Natural Habitats	<p><i>“Development proposals should demonstrate that they comply with the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as established by the Environment Act 2021”</i>- Technically this is already a statutory duty anyway. If Werrington wishes to put a policy in place that goes above and beyond the existing statutory duty this would be the place to do it. Examples could include putting policies in place that require specific habitats to be used as onsite compensation, identifying areas which would be preferred for BNG provision or requiring specific designs of green space (for example all at the edges of developments or equally spaced through the development Etc.)</p> <p><i>“Biodiversity Value”</i>- Dangerous term as within the BNG metric almost all habitats have “value”. Recommend replacing this with <i>“expected to retain features of moderate distinctiveness as described within the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain Metric”</i>. Then this will cover wildflower meadows and woods etc.</p> <p>Where is <i>“Map X”</i>?</p> <p>*Add in bold*- Development proposals should, wherever possible, seek to enhance connectivity of green networks through the inclusion of strong landscaping schemes that include native trees, native shrubs, species rich hedgerows, green roofs, and green walls and avoid the loss of trees within residential curtilages or within streets. There will be a presumption that the Habitats and Green Infrastructure as described within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy will be implemented as described (To be published in Winter 2024).</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which would cause the loss or harm to wildlife habitats, features of biodiversity and natural features such as trees, woodlands, hedgerows, watercourses or ponds will not be permitted unless the need for and benefits of the development outweigh any adverse impacts and where similar replacement habitats are provided as part of the proposal that will result in at least a neutral impact on biodiversity.”</i> - This section is a little in conflict with the Biodiversity Net Gain legalisation which requires a net positive impact on biodiversity. This could be a suitable place to insert some words targeting specific species and habitats which are significant to Werrington, which benefits created for would be particularly sought after.</p> <p><i>“Development proposals should provide at least a 10% net biodiversity gain in line with the applicable legislative requirements.”</i>- This is an opportunity to request more than 10% should be aspirational. Or that any off site units should be purchased where possible to aid in the creation of Werrington green space.</p> <p><i>The net gain for biodiversity should be calculated using Natural England’s Biodiversity Metric.</i>-(Remove as this is a statutory requirement).</p>
	Schedule 1: Schedule of Notable Trees	The council acknowledge the aspiration to retain and preserve tree avenues within Werrington. The council support their management to perpetuate these important landscape features, yet ask that policy TP29 and TP30 of the Council's Trees and Woodland Strategy (see extract below) are acknowledged, in respect to the

		<p>need manage these assets in respect to their future growth potential, threats from pest and disease and property subsidence. This may lead to some changes in respect to the tree's species diversity, or the need for more significant pruning in the coming years.</p> <p>“Avenues and other Arboricultural Features</p> <p>Policy TP29: To maintain formal arboricultural features in the urban landscape by careful management and timely renewal as required.</p> <p>Priorities:</p> <p>TP29.1 To consider the long-term development and safe life expectancy of mature avenues and instigate a policy of gradual renewal and replacement in advance of them becoming untenable. Measures could include pruning, total removal and replacement, partial removal, and replacement.</p> <p>Policy TP30: To take action to restructure avenue trees planted with inappropriate species too close to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Priorities:</p> <p>TP30.1: In areas where avenue trees pose a potential threat to adjoining buildings, the council will manage or restructure the avenues to minimise the impact on the properties. Options will include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing avenue trees and replacing with low water demand species. • Removing avenue trees adjoining buildings and filling the gaps with smaller low water demand species. As far as possible maintaining regular spacing and the avenue effect. • For suitable species such as lime and London plane reduce the crown or pollard to reduce water uptake. This will only reduce water demand if the trees are pruned on short and regular cycle of no more than three years.”
7	WNP7: Local Green Spaces	<p><i>“Development proposals on a Local Green Space will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances, in line with national policy.”</i>- Inserting a reference here to the Natural England Green Space Deprivation map may be useful to direct the creation of green space.</p> <p>https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Map.aspx</p> <p>The council are happy to support the proposed Local Green Spaces.</p>
8	WNP8: Former Sports Ground, Fulbridge Road	<p>This policy addresses and backs the existing amenity provision policy LP17 and these are considerations which a Planning Officer would have to consider if an application was to come forward. Therefore, the policy reiterates and supports the existing amenity provision LP17, by relating to the former sports ground on Fulbridge Road.</p>
9	WNP9: Recreational Facilities	<p>Reference to Appendix D in the Local Plan- refer to standards that have derived from local data and testing. These state 200m for LAPs, 450m for LEAPs and 800m for NEAPs.</p> <p>Refers to “Map X” still.</p>
10	WNP10: Footpaths And Cycleways	<p>Figure 27- It would be useful to have a key for the coloured lines on the map. Do the existing footpaths relate to the public right of way?</p>
11	WNP11: Business	<p>Transport statement required where development of 5-80 dwellings.</p>

Other general comments		
12	All	Ensure all paragraphs are numbered in numerical order (Spatial Strategy section)

2. LETTER FROM NATURAL ENGLAND

Date: 28 February 2024
Our ref: 464241
Your ref: Werrington Neighbourhood Plan

Ms Sally Weald
Werrington Area Forum

BY EMAIL ONLY
werringtonnc@gmail.com

Dear Ms Weald

Werrington Neighbourhood Plan 2023 to 2036 – Regulation 14 Consultation

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 17 January 2023.

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.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.

Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in [Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species](#).

Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission [standing advice](#).

We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk

Yours sincerely
Sally Winkle
Consultations Team



Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 8DJ

T 0300 060 9600

Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities

Natural environment information sources

The [Magic¹](#) website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones). Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available from [the Association of Local Environmental Records Centres](#).

Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found [here²](#). Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found [here³](#).

There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.

General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the [Magic⁴](#) website and also from the [LandIS website⁵](#), which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Natural environment issues to consider

The [National Planning Policy Framework⁶](#) sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. [Planning Practice Guidance⁷](#) sets out supporting guidance.

Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.

Landscape

Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.

If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.

¹ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-areas-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making>

⁴ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁵ <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework-2>

⁷ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/106/guidance/natural-environment/>

Wildlife habitats

Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed [here](#)⁸), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or [Ancient woodland](#)⁹. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Priority and protected species

You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed [here](#)¹⁰) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice [here](#)¹¹ to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see [Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land](#)¹².

Improving your natural environment

Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment and should provide net gains for biodiversity in line with the [National Planning Policy Framework](#). If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you should follow the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy and seek to ensure impacts on habitats are avoided or minimised before considering opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. You may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development and how these could contribute to biodiversity net gain and wider environmental goals.

Opportunities for environmental enhancement might include:

- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Think about how lighting can be best managed to reduce impacts on wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.
- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.

[Defra's Biodiversity Metric](#) should be used to understand the baseline biodiversity value of proposed development sites and may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains where detailed site development proposals are known. For small development sites the [Small Sites Metric](#) may be used. This is a simplified version of [Defra's Biodiversity Metric](#) and is designed for use where certain criteria are met.

Where on site measures for biodiversity net gain are not possible, you should consider off site measures.

You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:

- Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.
- Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. Natural England's [Green Infrastructure Framework](#) sets out further information on green infrastructure standards and principles
- Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see [Planning Practice Guidance](#)¹³).

- Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks or on verges, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).
- Planting additional street trees.
- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).

Natural England's [Environmental Benefits from Nature tool](#) may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside [Defra's Biodiversity Metric](#) and is available as a beta test version.

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licence>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-screen-planning-proposals>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space>

1. LETTER FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY 26th FEBRUARY 2024



Peterborough City Council
Planning Policy
Sand Martin House Bittern Way
Fletton Quays
Peterborough
PE2 8TY

Our ref: AN/2015/122967/OT-04/SB1-L01
Your ref:
Date: 26 February 2024

Dear Planning Team

Werrington Draft Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Statutory Consultation

Thank you for consulting us on the Werrington Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 14 statutory consultation). We would like to draw your attention to the following comments.

Flood Risk

Werrington has two main rivers: Werrington Brook and Marholm Drain. Both watercourses have associated floodplains with Flood Zone 3 and 2, extending into some of the built development. The flood risk areas have not been identified in the document.

We note that throughout the Neighbourhood Plan, Werrington Brook is recognised, however Marholm Drain, which is at the southern boundary of the neighbourhood, is not referred to at any point. We would encourage the recognition of both watercourses and the associated flood risk in the Neighbourhood Plan.

There is no guarantee that land in Flood Zone 2 or 3 will not be considered for development. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 165-171, we remind you that the Sequential and/or Exception Test should be undertaken if the Plan is proposing development or promoting growth, to ensure that development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. The application of the Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). It is important that the Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with any proposed development can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward. Without this understanding the Plan is unlikely to be compliant with the NPPF.

Groundwater Quality

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 180 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 189).

Environment Agency
Nene House (Pitchey Lodge Industrial Estate),
Pitchey Lodge Road, Kettering, Northants, NN15 6JQ
Email: LNplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/environment-agency

Customer services line: 03708 806 806
Calls to 03 numbers cost the same as calls to standard geographic numbers (i.e. numbers beginning with 01 or 02).

Cont/d..

With this in mind, we would recommend the inclusion of the following text, as supporting information in relation to groundwater quality:

The WNP area mainly lies over geology classified as a secondary A aquifer. These aquifers can support local abstractions and baseflow to streams and rivers. The use (or potential use) of groundwater in the area makes parts of the area vulnerable to pollution from certain types of development. Best practice to ensure groundwater is protected from pollution and as a resource is contained within guidance document 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements>. This publication sets out our position for a wide range of activities and developments, including:

- Waste management
- Discharge of liquid effluents
- Land contamination
- Ground source heat pumps
- Cemetery developments
- Drainage

Land affected by contamination may pose risk to human health, groundwater, surface waters and the wider environment. We recommend that developers should:

- Follow the risk management framework provided in <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/land-contamination-how-to-manage-the-risks>, when dealing with land affected by contamination
- Refer to our <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/land-contamination-technical-guidance> for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site - the local authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health
- Consider using the <http://www.clare.co.uk/projects-and-initiatives/hqms> which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed
- Refer to the <https://www.gov.uk/contaminated-land> pages on gov.uk for more information

Piling

Piling or any other foundation designs / investigation boreholes / tunnel shafts / ground source heating and cooling systems using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater.

Water efficiency

Peterborough lies within the East Midlands area of serious water stress where drought is a cause for concern. In view of this, we welcome Policy WNP3 (Sustainable Construction & Energy Efficiency) which acknowledges the inclusion of water efficiency matters in the Sustainability Statement. However, we would encourage including in this Policy a reference to all new dwellings should achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres per day for water efficiency, as described by Building Regulation G2. This is in line with policy LP32 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

Biodiversity

Cont/d..

We welcome the inclusion of Policy WNP6 (Natural Habitats), in particular the acknowledgement that proposals should aim provide at least 10% biodiversity net gain, which is a requirement of the NPPF.

We support that the plan has included the Werrington Brook and its associated green space in the proposed policies, in particular Policy WNP6 (Natural Habitats) which aims to protect and enhance it. This Policy also identifies Werrington Paddocks and Wildflower Meadow area which we note will contribute to protect and enhance parts of Marholm Brook.

Foul Drainage/Wastewater Infrastructure

Whilst there are no current concerns in relation to foul drainage capacity at Water Recycling Centres in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, we are aware that these situations can change especially as the Plan is to cover a timescale up to 2036, therefore we would recommend that early consultation with Anglian Water Services is encouraged for developers. This is to determine whether there is (or will be prior to occupation) sufficient infrastructure capacity existing for the connection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of quantity and quality of water associated with any proposed development within environmental limits of the receiving watercourse.

In addition, consideration to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) is advised in the Neighbourhood Plan, this would be beneficial in aiding enhancement of the environment.

It is recommended that extracts of the above information are included and used as background information to inform the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan. We would like to be notified by the Local Planning Authority of the decision on the Neighbourhood Plan under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Should you require any additional information, or wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below.

Yours sincerely

Miss Emily Fisher
Planning Advisor

Direct dial 07384064534
Direct e-mail Emily.Fisher@environment-agency.gov.uk

4. LETTER FROM HISTORIC ENGLAND 14th FEBRUARY 2024



By e-mail to:
Sally Weald
Werrington Area Forum

Our ref: PL00795042
Your ref:
Date: 14/02/2024
Direct Dial: 01223 582748
Mobile: 07033 718273

Dear Ms Weald,

Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Werrington

Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Regulation 14 draft Neighbourhood Plan. This is the first opportunity Historic England has had to review your neighbourhood plan. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process.

Neighbourhood Plans are an important opportunity for local communities to set the agenda for their places, setting out what is important and why about different aspects of their parish or other area within the neighbourhood area boundary, and providing clear policy and guidance to readers – be they interested members of the public, planners or developers – regarding how the place should develop over the course of the plan period.

At this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of the strategy for your area, but we offer some general advice and guidance below, which may be of assistance. The conservation officer at your local planning authority will be the best placed person to assist you in the development of the Plan with respect to the historic environment and can help you to consider and clearly articulate how a strategy can address the area's heritage assets. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) sets out that Plans, including Neighbourhood Plans, should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In particular, this strategy needs to take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of all types of heritage asset where possible, the need for new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and ensure that it considers opportunities to use the existing historic environment to help reinforce this character of a place.

It is important that, as a minimum, the strategy you put together for your area safeguards those elements of your neighbourhood area that contribute to the significance of those assets. This will ensure that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure your plan is in line with the requirements of national planning policy, as found in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The government's [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) on neighbourhood planning is clear that, where relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide local authority planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority's local plan into action but at a neighbourhood scale. Your Neighbourhood Plan is therefore an important opportunity for a community to develop a positive strategy for the area's locally important heritage assets that aren't recognised at a national level through listing or scheduling.

If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets, including sites of archaeological interest, locally listed buildings, or identified areas of historic landscape character. Your plan could, for instance, include a list of locally important neighbourhood heritage assets, (e.g. historic buildings, sites, views or places of importance to the local community) setting out what factors make them special.

These elements can then be afforded a level of protection from inappropriate change through an appropriately worded policy in the plan. We refer you to our guidance on local heritage listing for further

information: HE Advice Note 7 - local listing: <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7>

The plan could also include consideration of any Grade II listed buildings or locally-designated heritage assets which are at risk or in poor condition, and which could then be the focus of specific policies aimed at facilitating their enhancement. We would refer you to our guidance on writing effective neighbourhood plan policies, which can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning-plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood-policy-writing/>

If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Cambridgeshire County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also non-designated locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes.

Some Historic Environment Records may be available to view on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as a local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. In the production of your Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in the early evidence gathering stages.

Your local authority might also be able to provide you with more general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan, including the provision of appropriate maps, data, and supporting documentation. There are also funding opportunities available from Locality that could allow the community to hire appropriate expertise to assist in such an undertaking. This could involve hiring a consultant to help in the production of the plan itself, or to undertake work that could form the evidence base for the plan. More information on this can be found on the My Community website here: <http://mycommunity.org.uk/funding-options/neighbourhood-planning/>

The NPPF (paragraphs 131 - 141) emphasises the importance placed by the government on good design, and this section sets out that planning (including Neighbourhood Plans) should, amongst other things, be based on clear objectives and a robust evidence base that shows an understanding and evaluation of your area. The policies of neighbourhood plans should also ensure that developments in the area establish a strong sense of place, and respond to local character and history by reflecting the local identity of the place – for instance through the use of appropriate materials, and attractive design.

Your neighbourhood plan is also an opportunity for the community to designate Local Green Spaces, as encouraged by national planning policy. Green spaces are often integral to the character of place for any given area, and your plan could include policies that identified any deficiencies with existing green spaces or access to them, or aimed at managing development around them. Locality has produced helpful guidance on this, which is available here: <https://mycommunity.org.uk/resources/neighbourhood-planning-local-green-spaces>

You can also use the neighbourhood plan process to identify any potential Assets of Community Value in the neighbourhood area. Assets of Community Value (ACV) can include things like local public houses, community facilities such as libraries and museums, or again green open spaces. Often these can be important elements of the local historic environment, and whether or not they are protected in other ways, designating them as an ACV can offer an additional level of control to the community with regard to how they are conserved. There is useful information on this process on Locality's website here: <http://mycommunity.org.uk/take-action/land-and-building-assets/assets-of-community-value-right-to-bid/>

Communities that have a neighbourhood plan in force are entitled to claim 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds raised from development in their area. The Localism Act 2011 allows this CIL money to be used for the maintenance and on-going costs associated with a range of heritage assets including, for example, transport infrastructure such as historic bridges, green and social infrastructure such as historic parks and gardens, civic spaces, and public places.

As a Qualifying Body, your neighbourhood forum can either have access to this money or influence how it is spent through the neighbourhood plan process, setting out a schedule of appropriate works for the money to be spent on. Historic England strongly recommends that the community therefore identifies the



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU
Telephone 01223 58 2740 historicengland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU
Telephone 01223 58 2740 historicengland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



ways in which CIL can be used to facilitate the conservation of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, and sets this out in the neighbourhood plan. More information and guidance on this is available from Locality, here: <https://mycommunity.org.uk/resources/community-infrastructure-levy-neighbourhood-planning-toolkit/>

If you are concerned about the impact of high levels of traffic through your area, particularly in rural areas, the "Traffic in Villages" toolkit developed by Hamilton-Baillie Associates in conjunction with Dorset AONB Partnership may be a useful resource to you.

Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England, including on evidence gathering, design advice and policy writing. Our webpage contains links to a number of other documents which your forum might find useful. These can help you to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive, and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is protected or improved through appropriate policy wording and a robust evidence base. This can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

Historic England Advice Note 11- Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment, which is freely available to download, also provides useful links to exemplar neighbourhood plans that may provide you with inspiration and assistance for your own. This can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/neighbourhood-planning-and-the-historic-environment/>

The following general guidance also published by Historic England may also be useful to the plan forum in preparing the neighbourhood plan, or considering how best to develop a strategy for the conservation and management of heritage assets in the area. It may also be useful to provide links to some of these documents in the plan:

HE Advice Note 2 - making changes to heritage assets: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/>

HE Good Practice Advice in Planning 3 - the setting of heritage assets: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/>

If you are considering including Site Allocations for housing or other land use purposes in your neighbourhood plan, we would recommend you review the following two guidance documents, which may be of use:

HE Advice Note 3 - site allocations in local plans: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans>

HE Advice Note 8 - Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/>

We recommend the inclusion of a glossary containing relevant historic environment terminology contained in the NPPF, in addition to details about the additional legislative and policy protections that heritage assets and the historic environment in general enjoys.

Finally, we should like to stress that this advice is based on the information provided by Werrington Area Forum in your correspondence of 17th January 2024. To avoid any doubt, this does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed neighbourhood plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.

If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Ross McGivern
Historic Places Adviser, East of England
Ross.mcgivern@HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 98 2749 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.

