

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

Vision and Objectives			
	yes	No	No response 0
Agree with V&Os	53	4	0
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the surgery cope?</li> <li>• Nothing about policing and encouraging diversity.</li> <li>• New developments must include social housing, 2 bed and flats for 1st time buyers.</li> <li>• Character of village in danger. Sewage and school can't cope with pop'n increase.</li> <li>• Need to protect rural landscape not just rural landscape character. Need to build carbon zero homes.</li> <li>• We particularly like "New homes which respect the character of the village" and "Affordable homes which will be indistinguishable and fully integrated with the market housing"</li> <li>• Housing developments should be kept to an absolute minimum preserving the current green spaces &amp; agriculture, observe the village requirements not the builders profit.</li> <li>• I have particular concerns regarding lifelong sustainability with starter homes for young people and bungalows and flats for elderly and infirm.</li> <li>• Important to retain the identity of the village despite expansion of housing.</li> <li>• A lot of work has gone into this and the overall vision is to be commended.</li> <li>• Agree with the broad objectives in the plan. Would be desirable to see the details before commenting further.</li> <li>• Yes the character of the village must be maintained. No more characterless estates on the fringes of the village.</li> <li>• The plan doesn't give specific details &amp; state the number of developments the village can support. What plan?</li> <li>• Very interesting. Well thought through.</li> <li>• If Farnsfield is to be a village a ban on major development is appropriate. Continuous expansion at any rate leads to a township; that is how towns appear. We have our share of development already. There should be a cap at current levels. Big builders will steamroller plans if any half-hearted approach is adopted.</li> <li>• Farnsfield must not lose its unique character as a village by obtrusive developments such as the one applied for reference 16/01575/OUTM</li> <li>• Replace 'superior' quality of life with 'good' Superior smacks of elitism</li> <li>• Broadly agree with objectives. However, one is missing. The management of traffic flow through and around the village which is key to many other parts of this section.</li> <li>• Would like to see a much more precise definition of quality of housing and also appropriate size of any development. Surprised to see no reference to building of houses to meet needs for future in terms of climate change, decline of fossil fuels etc</li> <li>• Clear and stringent guidelines need to be established that prioritises the needs of the villagers and not developers</li> <li>• Well written and the authors are to be congratulated. Strong emphasis placed on village envelope but area of plan is much wider, south to Combes Farm and west to Rainworth. Has the committee considered the potential across this wider area?</li> </ul>		

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just a load of meaningless jargon! Is this intentional? Centre of village is just one big car park almost impossible to drive through and can only be made worse with more building</li> <li>• The qualities given are the very reason the village is so popular, and the balance of keeping the character is essential for all who live here.</li> <li>• I think the phrase ‘throughout all stages of their lives’ is particularly relevant as there are obvious gaps in the housing in the village.</li> </ul>		
Disagree			
Summary:	93% of respondents agreed with the vision and objectives of the Plan. Village character and scale of development are significant within the comments. The need for affordable homes is also referenced in several comments.		
<b>FNP1 Housing</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	45	10	2
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more housing but not the proposed number</li> <li>• Need to maximise environmentally sustainability of developments and ensure not just encourage bio diversity.</li> <li>• Needs to stay within village envelope</li> <li>• Pre -existing sewerage and drainage systems need maintaining and improvement before</li> <li>• Size of development need restricting. Adverse effect on health education and traffic control. Drainage.</li> <li>• Is the Mansfield Road development proposal classed as inside village envelope?</li> <li>• History tell us that we have been poor at enforcing the payment by developers for infrastructure mitigation and improvements</li> <li>• Emphasise need for bungalows and assisted living facilities, the age question is more relevantly considered in terms of (dis)ability.</li> <li>• Need to keep the character, red bricks slate or pot roofs.</li> <li>• Smaller developments are important.</li> <li>• Could be difficult to maintain this approach against Govt policy and local authority planners.</li> <li>• Objections to housing always come from those who live closest to proposed sites, not always fair when they live in new houses.</li> <li>• It is sad to see that most new developments are unaffordable for young people in the village.</li> <li>• No new sites should be allocated for housing until all of the current allocated sites have been developed including sites that have existing planning permission.</li> <li>• The village envelope should not be extended.</li> <li>• Overdevelopment is possibly the biggest threat to the village and new housing must be compatible with the character of Farnsfield.</li> <li>• there should be no expansion of the village envelope until all the sites that are in the N&amp;S allocations and development plan document have been developed and all other sites in the parish that have planning permission for new development have been developed(e.g. the Southwell Road site).</li> </ul>		

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We agree that new developments will place considerable strain on the infrastructure, services and facilities. This applies particularly to health, education, roads, parking, sewerage &amp; drainage.</li> <li>• To expand beyond the obvious village centre would create a ribbon development &amp; takeaway from village community idea.</li> <li>• Yes development within the village envelope where it can be demonstrated it's appropriate within its position within the village.</li> <li>• Yes, as long as any future developments have no adverse impact on the village or its community. They must respect the scale and character of the village- not overshadow it, drainage , parking etc</li> <li>• Not enough green routes through new estates to connect with existing footpath network</li> <li>• Point 3: 'wherever possible' is too weak, surely it should be 'must'</li> <li>• Lack of focus on traffic issues; no 3 storey housing</li> <li>• Scale and character of village changes with every new development. 3rd paragraph is not strong enough; at its end should simply say: 'deliver necessary improvements' leaving out 'wherever possible' and 'seek to'</li> <li>• Any new developments should be dependent on upgrades to infrastructure and key facilities such as health and education</li> <li>• Village far too overcrowded as it is. Driving from one end to the other is nearly impossible. New residents speeding through in their 4x4s</li> </ul>		
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building even indiv houses leads to overloading of schools, doctors, traffic congestion, sanitation. Live in a village not a town.</li> <li>• More robust approach needed to protect green belt. Approach too loose on new development.</li> <li>• No more large builder developments. Developments restricted to &lt;10 houses in addition to statements in FNP1.</li> <li>• There does not appear to be further sites within the envelope for this. The character of the village has changed since we brought our young family here and cannot be re-invented.</li> <li>• Enough is enough</li> <li>• No further large development of houses. Infrastructure can't cope and will it still be a 'village'</li> <li>• The village should not expand any further as it is already 'large' and starting to overwhelm its facilities</li> <li>• The plan is proposing to support all development as long as it meets 4 broad criteria. These criteria avoid mention of the 3 issues most people in the village will be concerned with. 1. Number of houses/applications and 2. Locations that have our support or not. 3. Local facilities – what needs to be done to support to support more housing.</li> <li>• I think that the actual size/width of roads should be considered when new developments are proposed. Many of the roads are not suitable for heavy traffic.</li> <li>• As long as no amendments are made to the village envelop.</li> </ul>		
Summary:	<p>79% of respondents agreed with the policy.  Maintaining the village envelope and developing existing allocations is a prominent feature in the comments, as is the size of any new development(s)</p>		
<b>FNP2 Infill</b>			
	Yes	No	No response

Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

Agree with Policy	45	11	1
<p>Individual Comments: Agree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes provided its in character</li> <li>• Ok as long as its not obtrusive and fits in with architectural style</li> <li>• Existing systems will soon be over-stretched. In terms of drainage and sewerage</li> <li>• No more than 3 per plot</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point should read “it would include measures to maximise environmentally sustainable development and ensure bio diversity”</li> <li>• Infill developments must follow the approach for new developments set out in FNP1.In particular surface and foul water drainage capacity</li> <li>• Infill should meet need re: starter homes and bungalows and in particular a nursing home complex.</li> <li>• Needs to be sensitive to surrounding area &amp; fit in with existing house styles.</li> <li>• The retention of the few remaining green spaces are essential to the feeling of “well-being” of all residents.</li> <li>• Infill within the village envelope makes good use of land for housing as this type of development is more likely to reflect the character of the village.</li> <li>• Too much infilling has already led to problems with on street car parking and congestion.</li> <li>• In some places the village already appears to be very cramped.</li> <li>• no objection provided :-</li> <li>• a) it is commensurate with the site being developed (i.e. it should not be used by the developer to cram in too many properties on a small site)</li> <li>• b) at least 15%of each dwelling on the site should be a garden or open area coupled with a planning restriction that no part of that area be covered over by later buildings or converted to hard standing for vehicles</li> <li>• c)all vehicle parking should be on site with an absolute prohibition on on-street parking.</li> <li>• Well thought out and designed houses that reflect the character of neighbouring properties are a suitable way of using land within the village envelope.</li> <li>• Infill development will spoil the rural character of the village and create a precedent for future development.</li> <li>• Cautionary note-: where there is no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and no “garden Grabbing”.</li> <li>• The plan does not go far enough; we have met the quota for new housing. We should not support any new development</li> <li>• New dwellings and infill plots must be in keeping with the existing village buildings. Access, car parking and drainage must be accommodated</li> <li>• No 3 storey housing</li> <li>• There needs to be clarity in distinguishing between different sized infill plots. Single property sites not an issue. Multiple property site same as housing developments</li> <li>• Try driving at 30mph and you get tailgated by big Audis with their important headlights on. Mansfield Rd is one big car park</li> <li>• Infill should not be on existing green spaces. Focus should be empty properties or re-using large garden space. Although there is little scope still available....</li> <li>• As long as no high density developments take place</li> </ul>		

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of term “amenity” is too ambiguous.</li> <li>• Developments restricted to &lt;10 houses in addition to statements in FNP2.</li> <li>• I do not think that infill developments should be encouraged at all as they inevitably affect the nature of all the surrounding buildings.</li> </ul>		
Summary:	<p>79% of respondents agreed with the policy. Despite high levels of agreement the comments reflect a range of viewpoints. Parking is mentioned in several comments as is the importance of building style and character.</p>		
<b>FNP3 Affordable</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	45	11	1
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must include accommodation for disabled people within easy reach of shops</li> <li>• Younger people can't afford deposit on houses. Have a £250,000 price range max.</li> <li>• Found Last sentence hard to understand</li> <li>• Not sure what affordable means but need young people to be able to remain</li> <li>• For older people and young newly weds</li> <li>• Need to support people both independently /semi-indep.</li> <li>• Priority to residents</li> <li>• Important. Danger of creating a commuter village which young and old have to leave.</li> <li>• Must be within village envelope. Word adjacent is misleading. Vulnerable need to be in centre of village</li> <li>• housing not just for older people but disabled people on low incomes.</li> <li>• This is a priority for Farnsfield.</li> <li>• Definition of “affordable” needs to be carefully considered.</li> <li>• With the ridiculously high prices of properties to buy, i think there is great need for properties to rent would support Council or Housing Association developments.</li> <li>• With an aging population bungalows are desirable. However many bungalows are being converted to 2 storey homes.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be a priority. Such homes could make up 100% of infill development.</li> <li>• “affordable” should be a strictly defined term-say limited to 3 bedrooms so as to prevent developers building excessively large homes.</li> <li>• Yes where its within or adjacent to main built up area of Farnsfield.</li> <li>• We need more bungalows, starter homes and smaller properties.</li> <li>• Need affordable housing to keep young residents within the village</li> <li>• Definitely need more affordable housing; would like to see some type of housing association/social housing</li> <li>• Little affordable housing; developers maximise profit by building larger houses</li> <li>• Need bungalows for the elderly</li> <li>• Can you define ‘exceptional sites’ in some reasonable detail please</li> <li>• Should include section on there being on-site parking- too many vehicles left on the streets</li> <li>• Too many expensive homes, with only token gesture for bungalows</li> </ul>		

Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I find the definitions in general use of 'affordable housing' too varied to be relied upon. Would be opposed to 'exception sites' being used for so-called 'affordable housing' that created a separate enclave</li> <li>• More specific guidelines need to be identified with new developments</li> <li>• The opportunity has been lost on Cockett Lane, and possibly should go up in time for the Southwell Road development.</li> <li>• Idealistic and not feasible.</li> <li>• A fair balance is required.</li> <li>• Again this needs to be within the context of numbers and locations.</li> <li>• This has to be a priority. We have a four bedroomed house but cannot afford a bungalow. The young need support to stay in the village as well as those on lower incomes</li> <li>• Would like to see table of schemes on offer, as we are aware</li> </ul>		
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New affordable housing should be within village envelope and be integrated within existing development as opposed to new major development as referred to in 6.2. This needs to be more clearly articulated in FNP3.</li> <li>• Developments restricted to &lt;10 houses in addition to statements in FNP3.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should only be developed on land already allocated for housing and should be within the current village envelope.</li> <li>• -Bungalows for elderly and with mobility problems appear to be in short supply within the village.</li> <li>• affordable housing should be provided on the allocated sites and sites with planning permission in the parish. Starter homes and older persons accommodation should be in the envelope of the village to make it easier to access facilities without the need to use cars.</li> <li>• Bungalows for older people should be a priority.</li> </ul>		
Summary	<p>79% Of respondents agreed with the policy.  Comments are generally consistent in support for affordable housing in a variety of forms and for properties suited to the needs of older and less mobile members of the community.</p>		
<b>FNP4 Local Employment</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	51	5	1
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local job placement linked to every 10 houses as an apprenticeship</li> <li>• Only small businesses related to agriculture and other local businesses.</li> <li>• Only small scale</li> <li>• Encourage green jobs</li> <li>• Could impact on parking along main street</li> <li>• Unused farm buildings beyond envelope to be used as offices/workshops to create employment.</li> <li>• It would be useful to provide opportunities for young people when considering establishing new local businesses.</li> <li>• Needs to be encouraged urgently, especially employment for young people. Consider the bus services out of the village that do not go early enough for apprentices involved in any construction work for example.</li> <li>• Agree within the current village envelope.</li> <li>• Not easy. The development for employment at the Cockett Lane development was never going . Houses make more profit than workshops.</li> </ul>		

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The village envelope should not be expanded to create employment opportunities.</li> <li>• A difficult one. But the recent development at Cockett Lane had industrial land but apparently it was too pricey so there should be restrictions/rent/lower land prices for employment.</li> <li>• As the majority of the working population travel out of the village to work, how can suitable employment opportunities <u>not</u> have an adverse effect on the character of the village?</li> <li>• Planners must address infrastructure issues</li> <li>• Needs to be more specific in terms of allowable business premises, i.e., size of property and number of employees</li> <li>• Would be preferable for FNP4 statement to be: 'development which includes new employment opportunities will be supported with the village envelope (as depicted on P32 of the evidence base) and within the wider NP area etc.</li> <li>• More shops would be welcome</li> <li>• This is important and needs more emphasis             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-small scale developments for micro businesses/start ups only. No large scale industry.</li> <li>-any developments of this nature needs to be considered in the context of the immediate neighbourhood to avoid adverse impact e.g. noise.</li> <li>-consideration needs to be given to the infrastructure-is it fit for purpose?</li> <li>-Big need to encourage small enterprises.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provided it is located so as to be sympathetic with existing uses.</li> <li>• I doubt though if additional parking will make any difference</li> <li>• to the parking problems in the village. (cynic!)</li> </ul>		
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much impact on village. Already have White Post, cafes, Wheeler gate.</li> </ul>		
Summary:	<p>89% of respondents agreed with the policy.</p> <p>The policy has a high level of support. Comments reflect concerns about the growth of the village envelope and by inference the sale of any employment uses.</p>		
<b>FNP5 Thriving Parish</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	49	4	4
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let Farnsfield thrive without introducing 100s of extra persons</li> <li>• Parking and Village infrastructure important</li> <li>• Relies on environmentally sustainable development that dos not damage bio diversity</li> <li>• Create more facilities for young people</li> <li>• Very loose statement</li> <li>• Maintain and encourage what is in the village and don't develop further</li> <li>• land off Cockett Lane could have been used for new Village Hall and Leisure facilities.</li> <li>• Recent developments have not increased 'thriving'. Newcomers have generally not joined existing activities</li> <li>• Neither possible nor desirable that the village should provide for every cultural and leisure activity that might be asked for</li> </ul>		

Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One thing that would maintain local services is additional parking. Without the Co-op car park I suspect the number of</li> <li>• shoppers using the village would reduce. It is encouraging to see this is already being done by dedicated</li> <li>• Villagers. Thank you.</li> <li>• We have a good community spirit with many societies. Mothers Union, Womens institute, Bowles, Tennis and Cricket</li> <li>• What is a 'thriving parish'?</li> </ul>		
Disagree			
Summary:	86% of respondents agreed with the policy. Comments suggest a preference for status quo with support for existing facilities.		
<b>FNP6 Other Uses Emp. Sites</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	45	5	7
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only suitable activities</li> <li>• More emphasis needed</li> <li>• The Hexgreave Park business park is part of Farnsfield, why is it not mentioned? What links can be forged in terms of employment opps.</li> <li>• The old Co-op is a place in particular.</li> <li>• Has the only employment site on Cockett Lane (Fa/Mu 1_Farnsfield Mixed use site) has now been used for housing development ? Is this policy still relevant?</li> <li>• Again the land on Cockett Lane could have been used as a care home or sheltered housing/warden aided homes, but recognise its away from local facilities.</li> <li>• What employment sites?</li> <li>• Can address issues such as care for the elderly</li> <li>• I am not agreeable for the development of care homes within the village and would rather support care in the community projects</li> <li>• I would support the adaptation of sites to cater for care for older people</li> <li>• The empty old Co-op – what a waste of space. Give it planning to convert to properties. At least it will stop the vandalism and improve the view of the high street.</li> <li>• Parking for disabled persons, of which an increasing number are inevitably going to appear, will become a significant issue.</li> <li>• Another 10 or so car park spaces somewhere on the high street would be very much appreciated.</li> <li>• Yes to the second paragraph. There is a growing need to support the elderly in the village, especially with the closure of Care and Comfort.</li> <li>• This section was not clear as what the Parish Council can and will do.</li> </ul>		
Disagree			
Summary:	79% Of respondents agreed with the policy. A perceived need for Elderly care provision has a significant emphasis within the comments.		
<b>FNP7 Quality of development</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	51	2	4



## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All developments should demonstrate zero or low carbon builds e.g Barratt Green House and Hockerton Housing Project</li> <li>• Character of Conservation area should be maintained but rest of village a lost cause. Must try to ensure more appropriate design Must blend with existing development</li> <li>• Density must be controlled because of stretched amenities e.g schools</li> <li>• Parfitt Drive good. Barratt characterless</li> <li>• Improving safety and promoting well being</li> <li>• Recent developments here have been good but not the case in nearby villages so needs more emphasis</li> <li>• Too many off plan town houses are being built-mostly unsuitable for a village and far too crammed together.</li> <li>• The quality of development is so important. The Barratts development is a great example of how not to do, it as it does not respect the character of the village.</li> <li>• Reply to FNP3 is repeated (-affordable housing should be a priority. Such homes could make up 100% of infill development. “affordable” should be a strictly defined term-say limited to 3 bedrooms so as to prevent developers building excessively large homes).</li> <li>• Scale is important. Need smaller developments but only if they don’t impact on landscape and conservation area.</li> <li>• It must address issues such as scale, materials, conservation areas and character of the village</li> <li>• Too many big brick house looking the same</li> <li>• The statements are not sufficiently strong. For example, the development at Cockett lane includes 3 storey ‘town type’ tall narrow houses that are completely out of keeping with a village setting and its approaches, in addition to the mentioned lack of chimneys</li> <li>• Totally agree</li> </ul>		
Disagree			
Summary:	89% of respondents agreed with the policy. Design and character are emphasised throughout the comments .		
<b>FNP8 Landscape</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	53	0	4

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

Individual Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More appropriate housing design</li> <li>• Don't destroy it. Uplifting to get out and good for wildlife</li> <li>• Hedgerows, ponds, grasslands and wetlands need protection</li> <li>• Landscaping must be an integral part of development not an add on</li> <li>• Make use of appropriate species&gt; Perhaps this should read materials or specifications.</li> <li>• Planning conditions should be enforced by NSDC.</li> <li>• More tree planting would be nice.</li> <li>• The Barratt development was not landscaped on the edge of Cockett Lane. No native species only a bank of grass.</li> <li>• Development should not have an adverse impact on the village</li> <li>• Developers often fall back on tree planting as the answer to everything; but trees take time to grow and planting is only done at the end rather than at the start of the development; trees not always appropriate, e.g., when the character of the landscape depends on open land or on a field pattern separated only by hedgerows</li> <li>• Strict guidelines need to be identified and adhered to so as to ensure development projects do not get amended and compromise the landscape requirements</li> <li>• Preservation of the landscape is a high priority. No turbines and solar farms within 5 miles of the village centre in order to retain its character</li> <li>• We don't want developments that spoil the approach to the village. Must keep it looking rural.</li> <li>• Reserve the large green open spaces. There seems to be a need to build on the green space on Hadleigh Park – leave it alone please!</li> <li>• Especially final bullet point.</li> </ul>		
Disagree			
Summary:	93% of respondents agreed with this policy. Comments generally emphasise the importance of good landscape planning and the use of indigenous species to fit in with the rural landscape and character of the village.		
<b>FNP9 Access Countryside</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	50	3	4
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great thing about village. Ability to access countryside without getting in car. Don't spoil</li> <li>• Everyone loves countryside. Peaceful walks, exercising dogs, rambles, joggers. Don't destroy. Improve.</li> <li>• Better maintenance of footpaths is needed. Signage and information can be provided and don't need "opportunities to improve"</li> <li>• Disability, mobility issues haven't been addressed</li> <li>• We are lucky with our footpaths but there are ongoing costs with maintenance</li> <li>• Unsure what this means? Transport to access it?</li> <li>• Some footpaths are very ambiguously signed or even kept open, a more systematic approach is needed.</li> <li>• Essential.</li> <li>• Footpath maintenance needs to be improved. Farmers tend to plough over many footpaths.</li> </ul>		

Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strict vigilance should be exercised to ensure that existing public footpaths are kept open and maintained so that access is not denied and also some should be upgraded to give disabled access.</li> <li>• Yes must signal where connections into footpath networks are but not allow paths from gardens onto Trail-too much garden waste is dumped.</li> <li>• Countryside/environment should not be destroyed by development</li> <li>• Not enough new green paths. Path from trail to Hexgrave stops at farm fence</li> <li>• Footpaths and rights of way bordering developments should be improved by developer as part of planning consent</li> <li>• Absolutely essential that green space for the public <u>within</u> the village is also preserved</li> <li>• Preservation of existing access and links should be non-negotiable</li> <li>• We have good access to the countryside with many footpaths.</li> <li>• I am surprised the St. Michael's View development did not</li> <li>• Provide direct access to the railway track cycleway..</li> <li>• Respect needs to be given to the existing hedgerows along side</li> <li>• Foot paths.</li> <li>• By what means – there is plenty of access.</li> <li>• Some of the footpath/bridleways are not always signposted, and where there has been a signpost these have been taken down.</li> </ul>		
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban elite and local residents have no respect for countryside. Need a programme of education on country matters before more facilities provided.</li> </ul>		
Summary:	<p>88% of respondents agreed with this policy.  Comments suggest that there may be issues relating to maintaining public footways and that the village would benefit from additional green infrastructure and pedestrian routes.</p>		
<b>FNP10 Community Facilities</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with Policy	49	3	5
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities already exist. Bowls, cricket etc. No harm to add a sports hall</li> <li>• Keep cap on numbers as local amenities are already at capacity</li> <li>• Thought needs to be given to medical facilities and on street parking. Old co-op an eyesore, needs to be sold or let even if its to another food outlet</li> <li>• Surgery oversubscribed</li> <li>• More car parking and enforcement of double yellow lines.</li> <li>• Yes, we need more facilities. More recreation not houses</li> <li>• Skate park</li> <li>• We need a new leisure Gym, youth club site.</li> <li>• Parking appears to be a low priority. It has been a problem for some time and will only worsen with current approved developments.</li> <li>• Strongly opposed to any plan to remove facilities provided by the existing village centre elsewhere. Wilson Field is a recreational area and should be kept as available for young people now and in future.</li> <li>• Youth facilities much needed.</li> <li>• Ideally the village centre should be reclaimed for village organisations and a separate larger building be constructed for sports, dance classes and larger functions.</li> <li>• I believe there is scope for development of the old Co-op (restaurant?) as the village grows.</li> </ul>		

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very important that developers understand needs of village e.g. play area on Cockett Lane is for kids only- what happens with older children? Not a facility for whole village either.</li> <li>• Facilities in the village need to be supported and provide a wide range of facilities to support the population make up</li> <li>• Not enough large play/climbing frames for teenagers</li> <li>• Appropriate/sufficient timescales for communication &amp; consultation to be established and adhered to</li> <li>• A good well used village centre and library.</li> <li>• Good idea to improve facilities at school with new village space.</li> <li>• Improvements in parking facilities needed. Management of double yellow lines!!</li> <li>• There is already a community hall – ie. Village centre</li> </ul>		
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• • Fear that development will go through despite views of residents and PC</li> </ul>		
Summary:	<p>86% of respondents agreed with this policy.</p> <p>The issue of parking in the village is raised in a number of comments including in association with the use of medical and other village facilities. Whilst views differ in the comments about how and where the ‘village centre’ is and its importance is reflected in the comments. The importance of retaining play facilities is also emphasised in the comments received.</p>		
<b>Character Appraisal</b>			
	Yes	No	No response
Agree with	50	3	4
Individual Comments: Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, agree, but no mention of the fabulous mature trees in village centre and conservation area. Are the trees protected in same way as buildings? Sustainable buildings are more important than aesthetic qualities to a certain extent.</li> <li>• Not just about conservation area. Ridgeway development is ‘open plan’</li> <li>• An excellent document. Much is made of traffic on main street but it does slow down traffic</li> <li>• Ensure the planning authority controls planning applications details to the full. No more missed opportunities i.e. Ash Farm.</li> <li>• Previous developments have not been sympathetic to that of a village setting such as Farnsfield.</li> <li>• Future development should be limited in size and appropriately designed for a village setting.</li> <li>• a number of previous developments e.g. 1950’s council housing and Barratt’s development on Cockett Lane have not been done with any consideration for the character of the neighbouring properties. Their scale and design are out of character. The Character appraisal guidance help address this if developers are forced to follow it!</li> <li>• Yes the housing created should be sympathetic to surrounding. Not sure what happened on Mansfield Road where new infill housing is not consistent.</li> <li>• Brickyard Lane and Nether Court were omitted from the list – do you think they should be added to the other properties section?</li> </ul>		

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should developers not be encouraged to build innovative, high quality schemes that add to the variety? E.G., good modern architecture that incorporates that incorporates the latest energy saving technologies</li> <li>• Don't understand the questions</li> </ul>
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be more detailed.</li> <li>• Limit size of village to current boundaries.</li> </ul>
Summary	<p>88% of respondents agreed with this policy.</p> <p>The many of the comments refer back to perceived weaknesses in previous developments and emphasise the need for sympathetic design and scale of development.</p>
<b>Final Comments</b>	
Individual Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to people who have worked hard on this plan. NB We have 2 hair dressers and a barber p10( see also email from Richie McPherson)</li> <li>• Main problem is congestion. Need a 20mph between Parfitt and Lion</li> <li>• Effort to maintain the paths on the Ridgeway. Clear paths to school. Trees on ransom pieces of land are ill maintained. Hedges from private dwellings and the school difficult to walk down</li> <li>• Pressure to develop outside existing envelope. Has council a fall-back plan?</li> <li>• How can we ensure builders stick to the plan?</li> <li>• Excellent report. main concern is flooding. This issue needs addressing</li> <li>• Speeding traffic on main street. Parents parking near school. Child mannequins near school?</li> <li>• I regret that what is written in plan is irrelevant as with landowners wanting to sell and builders wanting to maximise profits and government keen to build as many houses as possible we have architecturally uninspiring buildings converting Farnsfield from a village to a satellite commuter town.</li> <li>• Maybe nothing more is permitted but plan lacks precise specifics. The FPC strategy 2016 is surprising stating parking is not a priority.</li> <li>• The accompanying letter suggested viewing Plan at <a href="http://www.farnsfield-pc.uk">www.farnsfield-pc.uk</a>. But could only view it via hugo fox.com/community/farnsfield-parish-council.</li> <li>• Believe that the councils involved need to take into account the villagers views and concerns</li> <li>• Agree that there has to be more housing but 200 extra is too many. Traffic congestion on main street is bad and few parking spaces elsewhere. Good to see extra parking on Parfitt Drive. Provision for school and medical care has to be addressed.</li> <li>• Plans of this type are expensive and planners only take notice when it suits them. Accept we need more housing but infrastructure comes first.</li> <li>• An excellent draft which summarises the priorities and needs of the village well</li> <li>• Congratulations to all those who worked so hard on document. We hope it goes through</li> <li>• Could be more detailed.</li> <li>• Limit size of village to current boundaries.</li> <li>• Previous developments have not been sympathetic to that of a village setting such as Farnsfield.</li> <li>• Future development should be limited in size and appropriately designed for a village setting.</li> </ul>

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A number of previous developments e.g. 1950's council housing and Barratt's development on Cockett Lane have not been done with any consideration for the character of the neighbouring properties. Their scale and design are out of character. The Character appraisal guidance help address this if developers are forced to follow it!</li><li>• Yes the housing created should be sympathetic to surrounding. Not sure what happened on Mansfield Road where new infill housing is not consistent.</li><li>• Are we to assume that current applications will be passed? The plan does not give details of limiting the number of new houses we/can will support. Why does the plan not state that the village will not approve any more large developments? What about the other villages like Edingley taking more houses?</li><li>• Need to support those on low incomes who would struggle to buy even an 'affordable' house. Consider rented/leased accommodation?</li><li>• Future generations will marvel that we allowed such indiscriminate development in the countryside on such a scale</li><li>• The infrastructure of Farnsfield CANNOT sustain any more development</li><li>• Why is there not a connection made to the trail on the new estate at Cockett Lane? Steps needed at the end of the trail to the road at White Post</li><li>• Upton have just built or are in the process of building properties just for local people on low incomes</li><li>• Traffic situation around the village is dangerous and close to gridlock...indiscriminate parking in areas where restrictions apply...need enforcement action...no further developments to be allowed without addressing this issue</li><li>• Not sure that enough stress has been laid on the loss of amenities over the last few years...</li><li>• I hope the development on the Mansfield Road never takes place.</li><li>• Please ensure open communication with the residents on any largescale/planned changes that will impact on the attractiveness of this lovely village.</li><li>• The improvement of local transport would help with<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• employment opportunities outside the village, and bring in day</li><li>• trippers from Nottingham and surrounding areas</li></ul></li><li>• Well done!</li><li>• A single link on the Web page would have made this document much easier to find.</li><li>• I found the quality, clarity and content of the Plan very commendable. Well done.</li><li>• The priority areas most people would be concerned about are:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Numbers of new houses/developments.</li><li>2. Proposed locations of developments (where are they)?</li><li>3. Impact on local services and the village centre.</li></ol></li><li>• I do not feel the Plan (specifically FNP) does anything to address these points, there is no detail within the plan. How many developments/houses would we support? What locations would we support or not? What upgrading needs to be done to local infrastructure? This is at the point that you cannot drive through the centre at busy times!!</li></ul>
--	--

## Pre-Submission Consultation - Overall Responses Record and Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider this to be a comprehensive and sympathetic assessment of Farnsfield as it is now, with an understanding of the hopes of the residents that it may retain its character for the foreseeable future.</li></ul>
Summary:	The additional comments are quite wide-ranging but the majority reflect the themes of comments made on individual policies. Given the levels of agreement with the proposed policies and the nature of the comments made there are no perceived implications for the policies within the pre-submission Plan.