

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan

Village Discussion Meeting

17th March 2018

Notes from discussion groups

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan Village Discussion Feedback – Andy’s Group

Topic	Comments	Response to comments
Aims	<p>The table were in broad agreement that the Aims cover relevant issues</p> <p>Table suggested word change to Aim B:</p> <p>B: To protect, enhance and promote the historic and rural environment of the Parish:</p> <p>Economic growth, where feasible, should be an aspiration.</p> <p>Protection of assets should not just be historic assets.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>To protect, enhance <i>and promote the character of the Parish, it's historic and rural environment</i> by:</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Change to include 'character' as above</p>
Policy Areas	<p><u>Comments;</u></p> <p>T2.Issues of affordability was raised a number of times.</p> <p>T5.There was much discussion on prevention of flooding associated with development. Note was particularly made of flooding on Bridge Street, and its effect on properties there. Site selection should consider this aspect.</p> <p>T9.There should be a community asset register: The table prepared a list which consisted of the following:</p> <p>Allotments; cemetery; recreation ground; tennis courts; pavilion; Manor Room; Boy’s Room; Village Hall; the two village pubs; Bamford’s Lane as a pedestrian way; play school; school and playground; green spaces (Lancelot’s Piece, Community Garden, Community Orchard, Memorial,</p>	<p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This issue is also tested in site selection criteria 10</p> <p>To be addressed in General Evidence section of the plan</p>

	<p>The Green, Walkway on Jack's Lane, land by Three Fyshes); Registered Park and Garden; Woodland around village; Jonah Statue and land surrounding, railway line; Turvey Bridge, mature trees and tree belts, Lady Bec Walk, Ouse Valley walks, village shops, villages places of worship,</p> <p>T11. There was discussion that the road system should be altered to best fit emerging new development</p> <p>T2. Other aspects considered included issue of off-road parking</p> <p>T12. and the provision of a cycle way and improved footpath to Station End.</p> <p>There was discussion of getting views of the emerging plan from people in the age range of c. 18-35.</p> <p>Discussion on getting wider public consultation on all submitted application so opportunity to comment on them can be had.</p>	<p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for consultation planning</p> <p>Refer for awareness raising re process for public consultation on planning applications</p>
<p>Site Selection Criteria</p>	<p>Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document – Overall Approach</p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <p><u>1st bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The table were in broad agreement that new development should be within, or adjacent to the designated SPA, with an exception option for Station End. <p><u>2nd bullet point;</u></p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a view that any extension to the SPA should be clearly defined with exacting boundaries for discussion, rather than broadly covering other parts of the village. • Agreement that each site should be judged on its own merits. <p><u>8th bullet point;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement of development areas with smaller numbers of houses; say 10-15, rather than one site to accommodate all of the requested allocation. <p>Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document – Criteria</p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>The table were in agreement on the site selection criteria.</p> <p>There was some discussion on the preferred use of any 'brownfield' sites.</p> <p>There was discussion on whether equal weighting should be given to all parameters. It felt like more weight should be given to statutorily protected sites/areas (i.e. statutory designations), rather than those that are not.</p> <p>There should be no loss to sites which presently have amenity value; new development should seek to add amenity value where possible</p>	<p>Noted for further consideration in allocations policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Weighting approach added to revised site selection criteria</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Site Selection Criteria</p>	<p><u>Site Selection Criteria - Overall Approach</u></p> <p>Overall approach agreed</p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <p><u>1st bullet point;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should read “through <u>incremental</u> extensions to the Turvey settlement boundary” to reflect the need to phase in development over time rather than delivered in a short timescale of the plan period <p><u>2nd bullet point;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “smaller sites” is unclear and needs to be defined • Should add that development locations should be dispersed around different locations in the village <p><u>Additional points proposed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the plan should encourage the involvement of smaller local businesses in terms of developers and builders in delivering development • the overall approach should set a maximum number of houses allowed for each development site allocated 	<p>No change to criteria but consider in allocations policy</p> <p>Change to '<u>multiple sites, rather than delivering development on one site only</u>'</p> <p>Rewording proposed as dispersed '<u>across different locations within the Parish</u>'</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy Development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p><u>Site Selection Criteria</u></p> <p>The criteria were agreed as covering appropriate areas</p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria 3 - should be revised to state ‘within the village or existing settlements’ • Criteria 4 - should be revised to state ‘‘‘impact on valued landscapes and views’ • Criteria 5 should be revised to state ‘‘impact on the setting of historic buildings <u>and heritage assets</u>’ (where the open landscape setting is fundamental to the historic building(s) <u>and historic asset(s)</u>)’ • Criteria 8 - village ‘centre’ would be clearer than ‘core’ • Criteria 8 - should be clear that the distances refer to ‘walking distances’ • Criteria 8 - Some members expressed the view that proximity to the village does not determine the level of use of local facilities, a multiplicity of factors come to bear on this and proximity is not the predominant factor • Criteria 10 - should state ‘<u>any type</u> of flooding’ • Criteria 12 - should be clear that the distances refer to ‘walking distances’ <p>An additional criteria is proposed as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘‘Would development of the site have a negative impact on bio diversity and eco systems’ 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Rewording agreed as ‘absorbed sympathetically <u>with the built areas of the Parish</u>’</p> <p>AGREED</p> <p>AGREED</p> <p>‘Core’ preferred</p> <p>AGREED</p> <p>Taken into account in the weighting proposal</p> <p>‘Flooding’ preferred</p> <p>AGREED</p> <p>AGREED</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan Village Discussion Feedback – Paul’s Group

Topic	Comments	Response to comments
Aims	Aims agreed as appropriate	Noted
Policy Areas	<p>Proposed policy areas agreed as suitable</p> <p><u>Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose agreed <p>T2.All agreed that social & affordable housing should be a high priority.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Important to provide adequate off road car parking.</p> <p><u>Landscape and nature</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose agreed <p>T3.All agreed to preserving and enhancing landscape settings.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">All agreed that we should make Green Space designations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The current Open Space areas shown on Policy Map 35 should be considered as well as the area around the mill stream and grassy banks below the bridge.</p> <p>T4.All agreed that protecting the natural environment and valued landscapes were a priority in order to conserve the rural character of Turvey.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development Greenspace audit and designation proposals to be developed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>

	<p>There should be specific consideration of biodiversity</p> <p>T5.All agreed that drainage was important and mentioned areas of Turvey that suffer from flooding.</p> <p><u>Design and Built Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose agreed <p>T7/T8.All agreed that design was another key issue in ensuring that development blends in with existing housing.</p> <p>Special consideration needs to be given to the historic buildings which are a prominent feature of the built environment and reflect village heritage</p> <p><u>Employment and Community</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose agreed <p>T9.General agreement that our local facilities, shops and community resources are highly valued by residents and need continuing support</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose agreed <p>T12.Turvey is popular with cyclists from inside and outside the village. The pavement alongside the A428 going east is a dangerous route for pedestrians and cyclists because of the speed of vehicles including HGVs travelling between the main village and Station End.</p>	<p>Noted for further consideration in policy development and other areas of the plan where appropriate</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development Also feed into Non Neighbourhood Planning Issues</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Although there is a good footpath across the fields between the main village and Station End this is not suitable in wet weather. A cycle way would provide a really positive opportunity for Station End residents, including young families, to cycle into the village.</p> <p>(There are moves taking place in the neighbouring Parish of Stevington to establish a cycle way from Bedford to Turvey and beyond. This would open a wide range of opportunities for Turvey residents and others to access cycle routes in the Borough.)</p> <p><u>Additional areas</u></p> <p>Some consideration should be given to Education</p> <p>Issue of demographic sustainability needs to be built into the plan ie., creating encouragement/better opportunities for younger people and young families to stay in the village and move into the village</p> <p><u>Non Neighbourhood Planning Issues</u></p> <p>General support for measures to engage health providers in discussion about opportunity to access some health facilities in the village</p> <p>General support for trying to gain access to riverside meadow footpaths</p>	<p>Noted for further consideration in policy development Also feed into Non Neighbourhood Planning Issues</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>To be noted for Non Neighbourhood Planning Issues</p> <p>To be noted for Non Neighbourhood Planning Issues</p>
<p>Site Selection Criteria</p>	<p><u>Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document - Overall Approach</u></p> <p><u>1st bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree approach should be to make allocations by extending the SPA 	<p>Noted</p>

	<p><u>2nd bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree a specific allocation at Station End should be considered <p><u>7th bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to aim to make allocations within the Local Plan target of 25 to 50 houses supported. This is in line with the level of development that has taken place in previous Local Plan/Development Plan cycles. <p><u>8th bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach to allocate more than one site was supported on the basis of a preference to restrict the scale at any location to a maximum of 25 houses in order to manage the impact of new development. <p>This is consistent with the scale of previous development in Turvey which was seen to have been reasonably successful in being absorbed into the village character without dominating existing housing.</p> <p><u>Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document - Criteria</u></p> <p><u>3rd bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighting - the option to identify some criteria carrying more weight than others through the identification of primary and secondary criteria was supported. Criteria 1 to 6 were proposed as primary criteria <p><u>Site Selection Criteria</u></p> <p><u>Criteria</u></p> <p>The criteria were agreed as covering all appropriate areas</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in Allocations Policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Weighting approach included in revised site selection criteria</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Criteria 4 - valued landscapes/views - the following were put forward as having particular sensitivity and should be protected from development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the village approach from the east with Turvey Abbey and parklands to the south and open fields to the north • the views across and down sloping open fields looking north to the conservation area and church from the lodge road rising from Dors Cottage to Woodside Cottage <p>Criteria 5 - should be clear that the setting of all heritage assets need to be protected, not just the church, Turvey House and the designated historic park and gardens.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Reword criteria to '<u>and other historic assets'</u></p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan Village Discussion Feedback – Russell’s Site Owners Group

Topic	Comments	Response to comments
Aims	<p>Generally in agreement with the Aims</p> <p><u>Comments on A</u></p> <p>Concerns about what is affordable housing and who is it aimed at?</p> <p>Noted that affordable was in reality too expensive for young native aspiring homeowners.</p> <p>Could sales be restricted to local residents. How would this work in practice? What about when they sell?</p> <p>Small houses/flats? What happens when they start a family?</p> <p>Should be a mix of age groups given that some “older” people might want to retire from, say, Bedford. Others resident in the village might want to downsize.</p> <p>There should be rented properties in the mix so both affordable and rental</p> <p><u>Comments on B</u></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>

	<p>Cost of providing affordable housing might go against meeting environmental considerations such as energy efficiency and visual impact.</p> <p>Smaller houses doesn't necessarily mean cheaper houses</p> <p>Parking must be contained within any development</p>	<p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>
Policy Areas	<p>Generally in agreement with Policies as set out but to include the following</p> <p><u>Housing</u></p> <p>T2: 'plus any infill development must make provision on site for Parking'</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>
Site Selection Criteria	<p><u>Site Selection Criteria Discussion Document – Criteria</u></p> <p><u>3rd bullet point;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoring should be on a 1 to 10 basis. <p><u>Site Selection Criteria</u></p> <p><u>Comments;</u></p> <p>Criteria 1 - "Existing" access could be a bad one e.g. Bamfords or Shorts Farm. Why would this score better than a potential for a new access?</p>	<p>Weighting approach included in revised criteria proposed on the basis of primary and secondary criteria not numerical scoring</p> <p>Noted</p>

	<p>Criteria 7 - All of the sites which are on agricultural land are of the same grade. So whilst this is of academic interest it doesn't help assess the site.</p> <p>Criteria 11 - too broad as virtually all sites are on open countryside. Perhaps this could be better assessed in respect of the aesthetics of each site.</p> <p>NB. A development could be considered to enhance an area not just detract from it.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is taken into account in Criteria 4</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan Village Discussion Feedback – Stuart’s Group

Topic	Comments	Response to comments
Aims	<p>The Aims cover all the keys areas</p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>All of the Aims were equally important</p> <p>It is key to control where new development is located,</p> <p>Adequate infrastructure was required to support any new development including medical facilities, schooling and bus services</p> <p>The group stressed that preserving the essential character of Turvey was key</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>
Policy Areas	<p>The Policy areas cover the main issues.</p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>T2.The provision of sufficient off road parking was key for any new development so that parking would not spill out and affect the existing road network in Turvey</p> <p>T3.Comments were made to express the view that Open space or green space was integrated within any new development and that it remains protected space going forward.</p> <p>T6.In terms of the design of new roads serving any new development the preference of the group was for curved, flowing streets which were sufficiently wide to allow traffic to flow whilst accommodating on road parking.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>

	<p>T7.In terms of design the following comments were made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design of any new scheme would depend on where it was located within the village, - It should maintain the character and reflect the look of the village - It should reflect the key architectural features of the village <p>T11.Concern was raised about the traffic pressure points within the village</p> <p>T12.Incorporating cycleways was deemed to be a benefit to the village</p>	<p>All noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>
<p>Site Selection Criteria</p>	<p><u>Overall Approach</u></p> <p>The Group agreed with the overall approach and the selection criteria.</p> <p><u>Site Selection Criteria</u></p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>The most important criteria are the initial criteria listed and the listing of 1 to 13 actually listed the criteria in order of importance</p> <p>General support to identify criteria 1 to 5 as carrying greater weight than the remaining criteria.</p> <p>Criteria 2 - it would be possible to limit any new development which would be accessed from either Newton Lane or Carlton Road to a certain number of housing units to reduce the potential detrimental impact upon traffic congestion along these 2 existing pinch points.</p> <p>Preserving the views into the village along the main roads were considered very important as indeed were views from the walks into the village.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Weighting approach included in revised criteria</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>These matters to be taken into account under criteria 3 and 4</p>

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan Village Discussion Feedback – Tony’s Group

Topic	Comments	Response to comments
Aims	All persons present agreed that the aims to cover all the key issues and there were no other aims they could add.	Noted
Policy Areas	<p>T1. All were in agreement suggesting that minimal housing should be within the SPA and site outside the SPA should have a higher priority.</p> <p>T2. All agreed that there must be adequate social & affordable housing. Units should have adequate off road car parking arrangements. Two people thought that there should be provision for older persons and a short discussion took place regarding the availability of senior citizen housing within the Barton & Royle complex. All agreed that housing should be of a similar standard reflecting the overall image of the complex. Provision for storing recycle bins and bicycles.</p> <p>T3. All agreed to preserving and enhancing landscape settings. All but two agreed on policy to protect Green Space. Two people thought it would be possible to use some green space to extend a building project.</p> <p>T4. All agreed protective policy for landscape sites, Turvey Park, Abbey Park the Mill. Two people mentioned that Bio Diversity was essential on all landscapes.</p> <p>T5. All agreed that drainage was important and mentioned flood fields and areas of Turvey that suffer from flooding. All agreed that housing should be allocated away from flood areas.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p>

	<p>T6. All agreed purpose. Houses should not front onto a road. New pedestrian crossing needed near Jacks Lane. All agreed that the village should be a safe environment with speeding controls along the High Street, smiling faces showing speed of driver approaching speed bumps in the road to control speeding traffic. One person mentioned that a bypass was needed.</p> <p>T7. All agreed that any building should reflect the character of the village and have adequate surroundings of green space.</p> <p>T8. All agreed that key buildings, Parish Church, Turvey Abbey, and Turvey Park etc. should be protected from relevant building protects.</p> <p>T9. All agreed that there are adequate shops and pub in the village centre. Could not see how new employment could be had by building only houses. Possible new employment could be had by building business units along with housing. Turvey has a large amount of employment businesses already in the village.</p> <p>T10. Most people, who live in the village centre, agreed that broadband speeds were good. Four people who live and work at Station End agreed that the broadband speed was far from adequate.</p> <p>T11. All agreed that bus services were very poor. Two people pointed out that they have to use the bus service to get into Bedford Railway Station as if they use their cars there was no parking spaces at the station after 8.30am weekdays. Other links to Olney were also poor.</p> <p>T12. All agreed that footpaths and cycle paths should be protected. New cycle paths should be added to any new housing scheme.</p> <p>It was generally agreed that enough time was not allowed to</p>	<p>Noted Noted for further consideration in policy development Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted for consideration in Non Neighbourhood Plan issues</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted for further consideration in policy development</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>discuss some points raised. Can the village hall be used for parking when visiting Central Stores? No Parking on the pavement and verges signs along the High Street. Both side off the road often block views for crossing the road. Can a one way System be put into place?</p>	<p>Noted for consideration in Non Neighbourhood Plan issues Noted for consideration in Non Neighbourhood Plan issues</p>
<p>Site Selection Criteria</p>	<p><u>Site Selection Criteria</u></p> <p>Overall approach Agreed</p> <p>Criteria 1. Agreed</p> <p>Criteria 2 - Agreed. Opinion was that sites within the SPA would add to traffic congestion at key points, Carlton Road, The Loop and Junction of Newton Lane and A248.</p> <p>Criteria 3 - Agreed.</p> <p>Criteria 4 - Agreed.</p> <p>Criteria 5 - Agreed.</p> <p>Criteria 6 - Agreed.</p> <p>Criteria 7 - Agreed but opinion was that only low grade agriculture land should be used.</p> <p>Criteria 8 - Agreed. But if over 1,000m from village centre then to get to currant amenities a car would be used or adequate cycle and foot paths should be available.</p> <p>Criteria 9 - Agreed but two people thought that a certain amount of trees and hedges may have to be removed on a selected site.</p> <p>Criteria 10 - Agreed although certain areas in Turvey have a flood</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

	<p>problem.</p> <p>Criteria 11 - Agreed but it may be necessary to encroach onto country side.</p> <p>Criteria 12 - Agreed but as previously reported transport arrangements would need to be discussed with the providers.</p> <p>Criteria 13 - Agreed but would a site be put forward if the owners were not in a position to build.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This criteria is intended to test deliverability within the lifetime of the Plan. If it was clear that the site would not be built out within this timescale, the site would be rated as unsuitable.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------