



# Dalston Neighbourhood Plan

## STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

February 2017



PREPARED ON BEHALF OF DALSTON PARISH COUNCIL

BY

THE DALSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STERING GROUP

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Dalston Parish - Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Project Timeline - Table 1</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. RAISING AWARENESS - GATHERING INITIAL COMMUNITY FEEDBACK</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Initial Consultation Events - Table 2</b>	
<b>3. Consultation on goals and Objectives</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Goals and Objectives Consultation - Table 3</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. Pre-Submission of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Consultation Events - Table 4</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Consultation Events: Attendance - Table 5</b>	
<b>Appendix 1: Launch Survey Results</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Goals and Objectives</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Statutory Consultees</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Pre-Submission Consultation Comments &amp; Responses</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Carlisle City Council Consultation Responses 2016</b>	<b>55</b>

## 1. Introduction

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal requirements of Part 5, Regulation 15(1)(b) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 by:

1. Detailing the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.
2. Explaining how they were consulted.
3. Summarising the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.
4. Describing how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Dalston Parish Council and Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (DNPSG) have built on the experience of preparing the “Dalston Parish Plan 2005 – 2015” and the “Dalston Design Statement 2005”, to engage local residents from the very start of the process in producing the proposed Dalston Neighbourhood Plan (DNP). Community engagement was “front-loaded” to develop a community-led vision for Dalston Parish, and objectives for achieving that goal. Subsequent consultations as the proposed Neighbourhood Plan took shape were undertaken using a variety of techniques to engage with a broad cross-section of interested local and national stakeholders.

The overall project timeline and programme of consultation is shown in table 1 below. Details of each stage of the consultation process are presented in the following sections, with additional information provided in the Appendices.



# Dalston Parish - Neighbourhood Plan Designated Area



<b>Table 1</b>	
<b>Project Timeline and Programme of Consultation</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>
December 2012	Dalston Parish Council registered its interest to complete the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan and requested that the plan area should be the whole of Dalston Parish.
April 2013	Official launch of making The Plan at the Annual Parish Meeting where a Launch Questionnaire was issued. Volunteers were asked to join the Steering Group.
June 2013	Community engagement exercises (Roadshows at local venues) took place to gather initial community feedback from all the hamlets in the Parish.
Summer 2013	Raising awareness through the monthly Parish Paper and Dalston Neighbourhood Plan pages setup on the Dalston Website.
Summer 2013	To further raise awareness a display and NP information desk was set up at the Annual Dalston Show. Further Launch Questionnaires were distributed.
Sept 2013	Housing Needs Survey carried out by the Cumbria Rural Housing Trust.
	Using the Launch Survey, consultation papers commissioned by the group and feedback from the community consultation exercises, the "Goals and Objectives" for the Plan were developed.
Oct 2013	Approval of "Area Designation" received from Carlisle City Council.
Feb - May 2014	Business Survey
Apr 2014	Parish Organisations Consultation
Jun 2014	Built Environment Report
	Environment and Open Spaces Report
	Health and Wellbeing Report
2014	Business Farming and Land Ownership survey
2015	"Dalston Visions" Residents' Survey
2015	Young Peoples' Survey
Jan 2016	Developers and Estate Agents' Consultation
Apr - Aug 2016	Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan developed from survey results
Sept - Oct 2016	Pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan consultation
Oct - Feb 2017	Analysis of comments received and replies drafted



## 2. RAISING AWARENESS AND GATHERING INITIAL COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

### Who was consulted?

To launch the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan a presentation and Q&A session took place at the Dalston Parish Council Annual Meeting in April 2013. Information concerning what a Neighbourhood Plan was and how it would be produced was presented and volunteers were sought to assist in this process.

Before the meeting, copies of the Launch Questionnaire were distributed to all those present to get initial feedback and start the process of community involvement in the Plan.

Several different routes were used to ensure widespread awareness of the events as described below.

- An article was published in the Parish Paper with a Launch Questionnaire inserted and delivered by volunteers to most households in the Parish.
- Notices were posted on community noticeboards, in shops and businesses throughout Dalston Parish.
- To reach the residents in the small hamlets remote from Dalston Village, “Drop-in” roadshow events were organised. See Table 2, Initial Consultation Events below.
- To reach the farming community, a display and information desk were set up at the Annual Dalston Agricultural Show.
- An introductory letter was sent to both the primary schools in the Parish and Caldew School, the local secondary school.
- Email, post and hand delivery were used to inform all the organisations, clubs, churches and societies within the Parish of the preparation of the Plan, seeking their opinions about local issues.
- Use of the Parish website, [www.dalton.org.uk](http://www.dalton.org.uk) to inform residents who use this technology.
- Housing Needs Survey, to include individuals known to need housing in the Parish and to also acquire the views of any business that has a housing need for its employees.

Table 2 Initial Consultation Events		
Date	Venue	Turnout
April 2013	The Annual Parish Meeting	64
1 <sup>st</sup> June 2013	All Saints’ Church, Raughton head	6
8 <sup>th</sup> June 2013	The Primrose Hall, Gaitsgill	8
15 <sup>th</sup> June 2013	The Reading Room, Cumdivock	6
22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2013	St. Michael’s Church, Dalston	11
10 <sup>th</sup> August 2013	Annual Dalston Agricultural Show	>150
27 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2013	Housing Needs Survey (1180 households & 91 businesses)	385 ret.

### **How were they consulted?**

Most households in Dalston Parish receive a copy of the Parish Paper published and delivered by volunteers monthly. During 2013 the Launch Questionnaire was distributed with the Parish Paper along with articles to raise awareness and provide updates on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan and details of events as they were organised. Residents were also invited to join the Steering Group and take part in producing the Plan. The Steering group was initially made up of 6 Parish Councillors and 6 residents but over time the personnel involved has changed incorporating residents with specialist expertise as and when necessary.

During June 2013, the Steering Group organised a series of Saturday morning “Drop in” roadshow display events held in the smaller outlying hamlets of Dalston Parish and Dalston Village.

A display and information desk was set up at the Annual Dalston Agricultural Show to further extend awareness amongst the rural community of the Parish.

At each roadshow, there were posters describing the Neighbourhood Plan process, maps of the Neighbourhood Plan area and key statistics regarding the village.

The Launch questionnaire was available and asked residents what they liked and disliked about the Parish, how they would like to see it evolve and the benefits new development should bring to the community.

Volunteers from the Steering Group were on hand to explain everything and encourage people to share their views.

Post boxes to return the questionnaire were provided at the “Drop In” venues, Dalston Co-op and the Parish Council offices.

The questionnaire was also made available online through the Dalston Website.

Over 100 people attended the Annual Parish meeting and the roadshow events with at least 100 people stopping to show their interest in the Plan at the Dalston Show.

In addition to this, we received coverage in the daily local newspaper, the “News & Star” and in an interview on BBC Radio Cumbria (August 2013).

During this initial period pages were set up on the Dalston Website which have gradually built up information as the Plan has progressed, informing residents who use this technology.

To assist with the feedback from these residents, a special mailbox linked with the Dalston Website [dnp@dalston.org.uk](mailto:dnp@dalston.org.uk) has also been set up which has proved useful as an alternative reply system for our various surveys.

To further assist with feedback from residents, a special post box for the Neighbourhood Plan was set up in the local Co-op store to receive the Launch Questionnaires and subsequent surveys when published.

To find out more about those living in the Parish who need to find their own accommodation The Cumbria Rural Housing Trust was commissioned to run a Housing Need Survey on behalf of Dalston Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

### What were the main issues and concerns?

All the questionnaire responses were collated to show the topics attracting the most attention in order of decreasing number of comments. See Appendix 1.

Topics attracting the most attention were;

- Sustain rural character 73.3%
- Traffic levels a problem 69.8%
- Threat of over-development 66.3%
- Parking 54.7%
- Speeding 26.7%
- Maintain good public transport links 25.6%

Topics with a lesser response but considered just as important when discussed at the roadshows:

- Not letting Dalston develop up to Carlisle boundary 19.8%
- Schools and services over-stretched 19.8%
- Not losing any further "green" land to development 18.6%
- Preservation of property giving rural aspect to village 17.4%
- Dalston Square architecture preserved 16.3%
- Dog fouling 16.3%
- Price of housing is a problem 12.8%

### The Housing Needs Survey.

Key Findings:

1180 households and 91 businesses were surveyed. 382 households (32.5%) and 3 businesses (3.1%) returned the completed survey forms.

77 (20%) stated their household or someone living within the household needed another home or to create a separate home in the next 5 years.

26 respondents need affordable housing within the next 5 years.

The main need is for rented accommodation and some shared ownership.

All this information was used to help the Steering Group focus on the topics most important to residents and these were used to determine the policy areas, i.e the goals and objectives of the Plan. See Appendix 2, Goals and Objectives:

- 1. Housing.**
- 2. Jobs and the local economy.**
- 3. Protecting our environment.**
- 4. Improving the community and services.**



### 3. CONSULTATION ON GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

#### Who was consulted?

- Every household in Dalston Parish was sent a copy of the “Dalston Vision” Residents’ Questionnaire (See “DNP Evidence Base”) and a brochure explaining the reasons for having a neighbourhood plan, which was delivered by volunteers using parish post code lists.
- Every business in Dalston Parish was sent a copy of the “Business Survey” questionnaire and an introductory letter explaining the reasons for having a neighbourhood plan (See “Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base”), which was delivered by volunteers.
- Every farm in Dalston Parish was sent a copy of the “Farming and land ownership business survey” and an introductory letter explaining the reasons for having a Neighbourhood Plan, which was delivered by volunteers. (See “Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base”)
- Young person’s survey forms and an introductory letter explaining the reasons for having a neighbourhood plan were sent to Caldew School “School Council” representatives to distribute to those students who reside in the Parish. They were assisted by a local youth worker who was promoting a link between the Parish Council and the youth of the Parish. (See “Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base”). NB. Many pupils are bussed in to this school and do not reside in the Parish.
- An advertisement was placed in the weekly local Paper, “The Cumberland News” giving notice of the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for Dalston Parish and potential developers and their agents were invited to attend a meeting of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to give their views concerning development in Dalston Parish. Subsequent respondents were invited to a Steering Group meeting to discuss their opinions.

#### How were they consulted?

- Each type of questionnaire asked questions related to the Goals and Objectives focussed on the situation of the targeted recipients.
- In the first instance the questionnaires were collected by the agent who delivered them. Subsequently a “post box” was provided in Dalston Co-op and a reply-paid envelope was distributed with the “Dalston Visions” questionnaire.

#### What were the main issues and concerns?

The responses to each type of questionnaire were collated and analysed using some specialist software to produce reports for each category. Free-form comments from each category of questionnaire were compiled into a spread-sheet to give an overall view of what areas of concern were most important to residents and businesses in the Parish. (See “Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base”),

Potential developers and their agents attended a meeting of the Steering Group and discussed their future aims within Dalston Parish. These were recorded. (See “Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base”),

Table 3 below shows the responses for each “Goal and Objective” consultation exercise.

<b>Table 3 Goals and Objectives Consultation</b>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Survey Title</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Aug 14 to Jan 15	Farming and Land Use Survey	24
Apr-Sep 2014	Business Survey	80
Jan-Jun 2015	Dalston Visions	426
22 <sup>nd</sup> Jan 2016	Developer & Agents meeting	7
Jun-Jul 2016	Young Peoples’ Survey	52



## 4. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION ON DRAFT PLAN

### Introduction.

A Draft Neighbourhood Plan was produced using the information from all the above consultations and local specialist expertise where reports were written in areas such as environment, local architecture and affordable housing needs. Specialist information, commissioned by Dalston Parish Council, such as Annual Traffic Surveys were consulted to build a picture of the changing traffic environment in the Parish.

Professional support and advice has been available from Carlisle City Council Rural Development Officer, officers from the Carlisle City Council Planning Department and additional assistance and training has been provided from independent organisations such as the Cumbria Rural Housing Trust and Locality.

### When did we consult?

As required under Part 5, Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, representing Dalston Parish Council completed a 6-week pre-submission consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan between 3<sup>rd</sup> September and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

Part of this consultation included dialogue with local land owners concerning proposals to make Local Green Spaces of land shown to be of cherished value to the residents of Dalston Parish in the Dalston Visions survey. Due to an over-sight, one landowning organisation was not consulted until after the main consultation started. To correct this, the organisation concerned was given an extra three weeks to comment on the proposal.

### Who was consulted?

The consultation was designed to obtain input from a wide range of stakeholders and residents.

To achieve this a Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Brochure (see the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Primary Evidence Base) was sent to every residential and business postcode within the Parish. This included local organisations landowners, farmers, schools, faith groups, clubs, societies, businesses and shops. The Royal Mail was commissioned to carry out this delivery. There were 21 premises outside the main post code group and these were identified and delivered by hand.

Appendix 3 provides a list of the national and local statutory consultation bodies.

### How were they consulted?

The Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Brochure contained a summary of the main issues and policies within the Plan, where to view it online, a “How to get involved” section and a table listing all the Consultation Events. This is listed below in Table 4: Consultation Events. A wide variety of times and dates were set to accommodate as many residents as possible.

**Table 4: Consultation Events**

Consultation Events 2016			
Road Shows	Date & time	Drop-Ins	Date & Time
Victory Hall, Dalston, Supper Room	Sat 3rd Sept 10 - 12 am	Dalston Parish Council Offices, Forge Green, Dalston.  The Draft Plan, supporting documents and comment forms available.	Tue 6th, 13th, 20th, 27th Sept 10 - 12 am  &  Tue 4th, 11th Oct 10 - 12 am
Victory Hall, Dalston, Reading Room	Tue 6th Sept 7 - 9.30 pm	<b>Please note the availability dates and times.</b>	
All Saints' Church, Raughton Head	Sat 17th Sep 10 - 12 am	St. Michael's Dalston.  The Draft Plan, supporting documents and comment forms available.	5th Sep-14th Oct Mon - Wed & Fri 10 am - 3 pm
<b>Parish Meeting, Victory Hall, Dalston</b> (with refreshments)	Thu 22nd Sep 7 - 9.30 pm	<b>Please note the availability times.</b>	Thursday 12 - 3 pm
The Primrose Hall, Gaitsgill	Sat 1st Oct 10 - 12 am	Carlisle District Council, Civic Centre Rickergate Carlisle. CA3 8QG	5th Sep-14th Oct Mon-Thurs 9 am - 5 pm
Reading Room, Cumdivock	Sat 8th Oct 10 - 12 am	Tel. 01228 817200  The Draft Plan, supporting documents and comment forms available.	Friday 9 am - 4:30 pm
Victory Hall, Dalston; Supper Room	Fri 14th Oct 7 - 9.30 pm	<b>Please note the availability times.</b>	

The Consultation Draft of Dalston Neighbourhood Plan was put on the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan pages of the Dalston website and the Carlisle City Council website. Hard copies of the Plan could be viewed at Dalston Parish Council offices in Dalston Village, St. Michael's Church, Dalston, Carlisle District Council offices in Carlisle and each of the roadshow and "Drop in" events. A hard copy of the consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan could be obtained via the post from Carlisle City Council.

A copy of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Primary Evidence Base was made available on the Carlisle City Council website and each of the Roadshow and "Drop in" events.

Letters and/or emails were sent to all the Statutory Organisations listed in Appendix 3 noting how to view the Plan and requesting feedback before the appropriate deadline. Posters were displayed on community noticeboards, and in shops and businesses throughout Dalston Parish.

An advertisement was published in the "Cumberland News", the weekly local newspaper for the area, giving the Pre-Submission Consultation dates and where details of the Consultation events could be found.

Consultees were provided with a range of ways to respond:

- Via e-mail to the special address (DNP@Dalston.org.uk).
- Any Roadshow or "Drop in" event depositing a comment form in the post box provided.
- Taking a comment form and putting it in the special post box in Dalston Co-op.
- By post to Dalston Parish Council, Forge Green, Dalston, Carlisle. CA5 7QG before Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

### **What were the main issues and concerns?**

Details of all respondents and their comments were collated into a spreadsheet by the Steering Group. A copy is provided in Appendix 4.

Some issues raised were beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but all the information will be passed to Dalston Parish Council for further investigation where appropriate.

Some of the more important issues were as follows:

**Defined Development Boundary (DDB).** The DDB was seen by some of the planning consultants as a restrictive measure.

#### **Stockdalewath.**

Residents of Stockdalewath consider its inclusion in Policy DNP-H2 inappropriate as there are no local services, a resident would rely on a car to access services within the village of Dalston

Significant portions of Stockdalewath are located within flood zones 2 & 3 and there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected with the hamlet.

"This hamlet could not be considered a sustainable location for development".

**Heavy traffic** using the narrow roads in the Parish causing concerns for safety.

**Parking in Dalston Square** is a continuing problem raised by many residents.



Planning consultants and agents acting for local land owners and developers who responded to the Steering Group invitations to take part, were included in the consultation. Their comments in response are included in Appendix 4 (Cons). Some of their comments lent constructive support to the Plan suggesting minor amendments to improve its clarity. Examples of these were regarding “The Vision” where “small scale” was changed to “an appropriate scale” to match the Strategic Aims of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 2030. Similarly, in the Strategic Policy “DNP-SP1 d” the term “existing” has been removed and “all new building and conversions” has been added to “DNP-SP1 c” which addresses quality and character issues.

In Policy “DNP-SP1 f” which deals with building within flood zones, particularly zone 2, the wording in this policy has been amended to conform with the NPPF. It now says “inappropriate development will not be supported in these areas”.

Some of the national and local statutory consultation bodies returned specific comments in addition to expressing general agreement for the draft Plan. These are shown in Appendix 4 (Stat).

Comments from Carlisle City Council (CCC) are shown in Appendix 5.

CCC generally found the Draft Plan to be appropriate from their point of view. Included in their response were comments from various officers of the Council giving constructive advice to improve the effectiveness and put forward suggestions with the potential to strengthen the policies in the Plan where appropriate. Some minor layout and document organisation issues, where appropriate were agreed by the Steering Group. Appendix 5 shows what actions have been taken.

### **How were these issues and concerns considered and addressed?**

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group considered all comments and a response to each is shown in the Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 spreadsheets. In some instances, the relevant policy/policies and/or explanation were amended to reflect the comments received, as shown in Appendix 4 and Appendix 5.

The spreadsheets of pre-submission consultation comments, and responses shown in Appendix 5 were posted on the Carlisle City Council website and the Dalston website. (<http://www.dalston.org.uk>) A recent edition of the Dalston Parish Paper (delivered to most households in the Parish) carried an article about the Plan’s progress and the availability of the consultation comments spreadsheets.

Most residents agreed generally with the Plan but some raised issues.

The Steering Group considered the following issues:

**The Defined Development Boundary (DDB)** is a considered approach at managing the future development within Dalston village, preventing “sprawl” at its edges and encroaching on the natural buffer zone separating the urban outskirts of Carlisle reaching the northern boundary of the village, thus damaging its rural identity. Many respondents to the “Visions” survey agreed that the Parish and Dalston Village should stay rural (Over 85%) and that there should not be any large increase in housing for the duration of the Plan.

In addition, the “Dalston Housing Needs Survey” demonstrated that there was a need over the next 5 years for small, affordable dwellings to become available in Dalston Village. Within the DDB there is sufficient scope of available sites, both green field and re-use of existing buildings to provide for this housing need, concentrating on small infill development within the sustainable core of the village.

The Steering Group has considered the comments from the planning consultants and came to the following conclusions: The Plan allows for windfall development in line with policy HO 2 of the Local Plan within the DDB. It also identifies other settlements within the Parish that could support new development of an appropriate scale and nature in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan. Should the City Council be in a position that a deficit in its 5-year housing supply is anticipated, then provision is included within the DNP to allow for searching in appropriate locations of the village for additional sites, as part of a wider District search. In this context, the DNP and the DDB are not considered contrary to the NPPF or the Local Plan.

#### **Stockdalewath.**

21 residents and 1 resident via a planning consultant, petitioned the Steering Group with their objection to Stockdalewath being included in Policy DNP-H2. The Steering Group considered this issue carefully and came to the same conclusion that this hamlet could not be described as a sustainable location for development. This, coupled with the flooding issues, caused the group to decided to remove this hamlet from the Plan.

**The heavy traffic** issue is partially dealt with in policy DNP-JE 5. Within the remit of the DNP this policy aims to reinforce the management of any commercial development, ensuring that any increase in HGV movements is planned for and the road infra-structure is improved to cope.

With the use of transport statements and assessments they can demonstrate how they would alleviate any increase in traffic levels and support the construction of a “Southern Link road” which would divert most of the through traffic away from the centre of Dalston where these issues arise. This would then alleviate the concerns over parking in the centre of Dalston.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The publicity, engagement and consultation completed throughout the production of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan has been open and transparent, with many opportunities provided for those who live, work and do business within the area to feed into the process, make comments and to raise issues and concerns. See Table 5: Consultation Events Attendance below.

All statutory requirements have been met and additional engagement, consultation and research has been completed.

This Consultation Statement and the supporting Appendices have been produced to document the engagement and consultation process undertaken and are considered to comply with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

**Table 5: Consultation Events: Attendance**

Consultation Events: Attendance		
Date & Time	Location	Attendance
10:00 to 12:00, Sat 3 <sup>rd</sup> Sep 2016	The Victory Hall, Dalston	23
19:00 to 21:30, Tue 6 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2016	The Victory Hall, Dalston	4
10:00 to 12:00, Sat 17 <sup>th</sup> Sep 2016	All Saints Church, Raughton Head	5
19:00 to 21:30, Thu 22 <sup>nd</sup> Sept 2016	The Victory Hall, Dalston	12
10:00 to 12:00, Sat 1 <sup>st</sup> Oct 2016	The Primrose Hall, Gaitsgill	6
10:00 to 12:00, Sat 8 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2016	The Reading room, Cumdivock	6
19:00 to 21:30, Fri 14 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2016	Victory Hall, Dalston	9
5 <sup>th</sup> Sep to 14 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2016	St. Michael's Church, Dalston	5



## Appendix 1.

### Launch Survey Results: 87 forms returned

Issues	Percentage	Total count
Sustain rural character	73.3	63.0
Traffic levels a problem	69.8	61.0
Threat of over-development	66.3	58.0
Parking	54.7	47.0
Speeding	26.7	23.0
Maintain good public transport links	25.6	22.0
Not letting Dalston develop up to Carlisle boundary	19.8	17.0
Schools and services over-stretched	19.8	18.0
Not losing any further "green" land to development	18.6	16.0
Preservation of property giving rural aspect to village	17.4	15.0
Dalston Square architecture preserved	16.3	14.0
Dog fouling	16.3	14.0
Price of housing is a problem	12.8	11.0
Litter	11.6	10.0
Completion of southern by-pass	10.5	9.0
Preserve our shops and pub	10.5	9.0
Need for a library	9.3	9.0
Preserve rural life of whole parish	8.1	7.0
Address housing needs	7.0	6.0
No further industry	5.8	5.0
Provide accommodation for the elderly	5.8	5.0
Better policing keep down crime and vandalism	4.7	4.0
Lack of local employment	4.7	4.0
Damage to verges by large vehicles	3.5	3.0
River erosion	3.5	3.0
Flooding Problems	3.5	3.0
Recreation for young people	3.5	3.0
Allow small developments in outlying villages	2.3	2.0
Restrict development between Caldew School & CNDR	2.3	2.0
Public transport poor in outlying areas of the Parish	2.3	2.0
Lack of nursery provision 5 days per week	2.3	2.0
Community WiFi/Fast Broadband	2.3	2.0
NIMBY residents are a problem	2.3	2.0
Do not allow building on the flood plains	1.2	1.0
Improve Street Lighting	1.2	1.0
Do not allow any further large industrial development	1.2	1.0
Village toilets are a problem	1.2	1.0
Preservation of river heritage etc.	1.2	1.0

## Appendix 2.

### Goals and Objectives

After analysing the Launch Survey, the following Policy Areas were set with their appropriate goals and objectives.

#### 1. Housing:

Goal
To provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.

- a) To integrate new housing into Dalston Parish so that today's rural character is maintained.
- b) To encourage provision of homes for younger people and young families so countering the growing demographic imbalance.
- c) To provide a limited amount of new housing to meet local needs, including a greater range of affordable housing for residents spread across the whole of Dalston Parish.
- d) To provide a mix of housing types including smaller homes for the elderly villagers wishing to downsize and for young single, couples or families needing their first home.
- e) To ascertain from Carlisle City Council what forward planning is available for sheltered housing and include this requirement in our DNP policies.
- f) To ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and is built to a high sustainable standard reinforcing local distinctiveness.
- g) All new development sites should be of an appropriate scale based on all available evidence.
- h) To give preferential access to some affordable housing for people with a strong local connection.
- i) To ensure that the design and location of new development is resilient to the effects of flooding.
- j) Preference given to "brown field site" development.
- k) There will be an expectation of 40% affordable housing in any new development within the Parish.
- l) Priority for smaller dwellings to address the imbalances identified. This includes:
  - Starter and smaller homes for private purchase.
  - Affordable housing for rent or shared ownership.
  - Smaller dwellings for residents to downsize.
  - Low priority for larger dwellings. It is accepted that a small number of larger homes may be necessary, in order to secure viability of allocated sites and deliver a minimum of 40% affordable housing.



## 2. Jobs and the Local Economy

<b>Goal</b>
-------------

To enhance the prospects for local employment.
--

- a. To seek advice from local employers.
- b. To encourage supply and use of Super-Fast-Broadband throughout the Parish.
- C. To encourage and support small businesses in rural areas

## 3. Protecting our Environment

<b>Goal</b>
-------------

To minimise the impact of new development on the surrounding countryside, landscape, and ecosystems.
--

- a. Identify, protect and enhance the Parish's open spaces
- b. To protect, enhance and conserve the landscape and views.
- c. Identify and press for designated "Green Spaces" between Carlisle and Dalston Village to prevent "urban creep".
- d. Conserve monuments & historical architecture
- e. Identify and respect industrial heritage
- f. Encourage recognition and conservation of the River Caldew which is an SSSI & SAC.
- g. To consider the environmental impact of Cardewlees Quarry and its potential future use.
- h. The built environment, conserve historical architecture and preserve important Parish assets

#### 4. Improving the Community and Services

Goal
------

To proactively sustain and improve the health, safety and sense of wellbeing of the people of Dalston Parish.
---

- a. Maintain the rural character and vitality of Dalston Parish.
- b. Developments should be of high quality designs which:
  - Respect the future quality of life for all.
  - Create safe and accessible environments.
  - Enhance an individual's independence at both a personal and community level.
  - Meet Lifetime Homes Standards where possible. (*ref. Health & Wellbeing in Dalston Parish*)
- c. Encourage and facilitate community groups to thrive and operate in a collaborative manner.
- d. Create a high quality accessible environment which will enable people to make healthy choices through physical activities such as cycling, walking, and using recreation areas.
- e. Continue planning for the regeneration of Dalston Square to provide a safe, attractive and "people friendly" centre to the village.
- f. Promote a sense of safety and security through the application of "design out crime" criteria to developments and the consideration of traffic volume and speed, parking and pedestrian safety. This would include continuing pressure on the County Council to build a "Southern Bypass".
- g. Maintain and improve levels of public transport.
- h. Maintain and encourage local services; this includes the provision of a public library.
- i. Consider the impact of extreme weather events.
- j. Encourage locally produced food through allotments and community gardens.
- k. Explore avenues of energy generation.

### Appendix 3: Statutory Consultees

Ref	Organisation	E-mail	Contact	Reply
101	Action with Communities in Cumbria (ACT)	lorraines@cumbriaaction.org.uk	Lorraine Smythe	
102	Allerdale Borough Council	ldf@allerdale.gov.uk	Julie Ward	
103	Beumont Parish Council	beaumontpc@carlisle.gov.uk	Margaret McKenna	
104	Bishop of Carlisle	bishop.carlisle@carlislediocese.org.uk		
105	Carlisle Access Group	Karen.Scrivener@carlisle.gov.uk	Karen Schrivener	
106	Carlisle and District Civic Trust	janisjeffery1@yahoo.co.uk	Janis Jeffrey	
164	Carlisle City Council	LPC@Carlisle.gov.k	Jane Meek	
107	Carlisle City Council (Highways)	keithp@carlisle.gov.uk	Keith Poole	
108	Carlisle Federation of Community Organisations	CarlislePartnership@Calisle.gov.uk	Anne Hannah	
109	Cathedral Office	office@carlislecathedral.org.uk	T I S Burns	
110	Church Commissioners	enquiry@churchofengland.org.uk		
111	County Councillor		Trevor Allison	
112	Crown Estate Office	Heather.Billington@thecrownestate.co.uk		
113	Cumberland & Westmorland Anitquarian & Archeological Society	gbrooksvet@tiscali.co.uk	G Brooks	
114	Cumbria Association of Local Councils	claire.rankin@calc.org.uk	Claire Rankin	
115	Cumbria Chamber of Commerce	rob@cumbriachamber.co.uk	Mr Rob Johnson	
116	Cumbria Community Foundation	andy@cumbriafoundation.org	Mr Andrew Beeforth	
117	Cumbria Constabulary	andrew.hunton@cumbria.police.uk	Mr A Hunton	√
118	Cumbria County Council	information@cumbriacc.gov.uk		
119	Cumbria Fire & Rescue Services	carlisle.technicalsafty@cumbriacc.gov.uk	C Division Headquarters	√
120	Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust	communication.helpdesk@cumbria.nhs.uk		
121	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	davidh@cumbriawildlifetrust.org.uk	David Harpley	
122	Cummersdale Parish Council	cummersdalepc@carlisle.gov.uk	Sue Tarrant	
123	Cushman & Wakefield (for Royal Mail Properties)	adam.pyrke@Cushwake.com	Adam Pyrke	
124	Dalston Parish Council		Dalston Parish Council	√
125	Department of Transport	On site contact form		
126	Dept for Communities and Local Government	contact form	Alex Turner	√
127	District Councillor		Ann McKerrell	
128	District Councillor		Nigel Christian	

### Appendix 3: Statutory Consultees

Ref	Organisation	E-mail	Contact	Reply
129	Eden Rivers Trust	director@edenrt.org.uk	Simon Johnson	
130	Entec UK Ltd (for National Grid)	damien.holdstock@entecuk.co.uk	Damien Holdstock	
131	Environment Agency	clplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk	Jilly Dougherty	√
132	Fields in Trust	stanka.dimova@fieldsintrust.org		
134	Health & Safety Executive	LOCAL.PLANS.CEMHD.5@hse.gsi.gov.uk	Adminstrator - Local Plans	√
135	Highways Agency	lindsay.alder@highwaysengland.co.uk	Mrs Lindsay Alder	√
136	Historic England	darren.ratcliffe@HistoricEngland.org.uk	Darren Ratcliffe	√
137	Home Builders Federation	james.stevens@hbf.co.uk	James Stevens	
138	Lake District National Park Authority	liam.mcaleese@lakedistrict.gov.uk	Liam McAleese	
139	MEP	contact@juliewardmep.eu	Julie Ward MEP	
140	MP for Carlisle	john.stevenson.mp@parliament.uk	John Stevenson MP	
141	Natural England	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk	North West Planning	√
142	Network Rail	Tony.RIVERO3@networkrail.co.uk	Tony Rivero	
143	NFU North West	jenny.willis@nfu.org.uk	Jenny Willis	
144	Orton Parish Council	ortonpc@carlisle.gov.uk	Patricia Macdonald	
145	Penrith & Borders MP	rory.stewart.mp@parliament.uk	Rory Stewart MP	
45	PFK	RachelLightfoot@pfandk.co.uk	Rachel Lightfoot	√
44	Policy and Investment, Carlisle City Council	garry.legg@carlisle.gov.uk	Garry Legg	√
148	Ramblers Association (Lake District Area Coastal Access)	job@btinternet.com	Mr Ian Brodie	
149	RSPB	tim.melling@rspb.org.uk	Tim Melling	
50	Savills (Church Commissioners Agent)	Jhadland@savills.com	Jennifer Hadland	√
151	Scottish Power	Crfeedback@ScottishPower.co.uk		
152	Solway Coast AONB	brian.iring@allderale.gov.uk	Dr Brian Irving	
153	Sport England - North West	planning.northwest@sportengland.org	Regional Planning Manager	√
154	SSA Planning Ltd	mark.mcgovern@ssaplanning.co.uk	Mark McGovern	
155	St Cuthberts Without Parish Council	andrea@andreamccallum.co.uk	Andrea McCallum	√
156	Stagecoach In Cumbria	matthew.cranwell@stagecoachbus.com	Mr Matthew Cranwell	
52	Taylor & Hardy	planners@taylorandhardy.co.uk	Julie Diamond	√
47	Taylor & Hardy (Agent for Cowans Ltd)	planners@taylorandhardy.co.uk	Sam Grieg	√

### Appendix 3: Statutory Consultees

Ref	Organisation	E-mail	Contact	Reply
46	Taylor & Hardy (Agent for Mr Coulthard)	planners@taylorandhardy.co.uk	Sam Grieg	√
160	The National Trust	alan.hubbard@nationaltrust.org.uk	Alan Hubbard	
161	The Woodland Trust	NickSandford@woodlandtrust.org.uk	Nick Sandford	
162	Thursby Parish Council	thursbypc@gmail.com	Jeff Downham	
163	United Utilities - Developer Services & Planning	planning.liaison@uuplc.co.uk	Dave Sherratt	



## Appendix 4: Pre-Submission Consultation Comments & Responses

### Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Consultation 3rd September to 15th October 2017 Comments received and responses from the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Notes
<p>This document contains all the comments from the above consultation and the responses generated by the DNP Steering Group. Most comments are a brief precis of the comment received but where appropriate a more complete record is included. All complete comments are available within the DNP Evidence Base. All contact addresses have been removed for privacy reasons but are available upon request from the DNP Steering Group. The reference number (Ref.) is a unique reference to the individual response. The entry categories (Cat.) is an indication of the type of response received and the listing is in category groups. Comments from Stockdalewath are grouped together to reflect the weight of opinion from that hamlet.</p>

Key	
Ref.	Reference number of reply
Cat.	Category of respondent
Cons	Consultant/Agent Comment
Gen	General Resident Comment
LGS	Local Green Space Landowner Comment
Stat	Statutory Consultee Comment
Stock	Stockdalewath Resident Comment

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>1. The Vision-</b> "...seeks to ensure that development is small in scale is contrary to the Strategic Aims of the Local Plan."	<b>1. Noted.</b> This has been amended to "an appropriate scale"
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>2. The Vision-</b> "It is considered that the constraining of development in a settlement which is eminently suitable is contrary to increasing of sustainable housing supply in the district...contrary to Para 47 of the NPPF".	<b>2. Not agreed.</b> The major development in the centre of the village is serving as Dalston's continued contribution towards the goal of Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Neighbourhood Plan in this context is therefore not considered to be contrary to national/local policy. Infill development within the Dalston Development Boundary (DDB) is still supported.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>3. The Vision-</b> " The Defined Development Boundary is considered to be drawn so tight as to constrain housing development in the village contrary to the strategic aims of Carlisle Local Plan 2015-30". Also it is considered that the constraining of housing development will not allow the Parish Council to meet the diverse housing needs for all by meeting the changing demographic and social requirements.	<b>3. Not Agreed.</b> The Local Plan does not identify any strategic housing sites within Dalston, and the City Council is able to currently demonstrate that it can meet its rural housing need with allocated sites across the District. The Dalston Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) allows for windfall development in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan within the DDB. It also actively identifies other settlements within the Parish that could also support new development of an appropriate scale and nature again, in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan. Should the City Council be in a position that a deficit within its 5 year housing land supply is anticipated, then provision is included within the DNP to allow for searching in appropriate locations of the village for additional sites, as part of a wider District search, should they be required. In this context the DNP and the DDB are not considered to be contrary to the NPPF or the Local Plan. DDB - affordable housing is coming forward on the Story development site.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>4. SP1d-</b> " ...not clear whether the conversion of existing and redundant buildings to a range of uses is appropriate in any location.	<b>4. Noted.</b> The term "existing" has been removed from SP1d, and "All new building and conversions" added to SP1c which addresses the quality and character issues.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>5. SP1f-</b> " Housing is acceptable in flood zone 2 under national policy".	<b>5. Noted.</b> SP1f amended the policy to ensure greater conformity with the NPPF.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>6. SP1-</b> " There is considered to be considerable tension between the strategic policies of the Local Plan which seeks to increase housing in settlements which are well served such as Dalston and the draft plan which seeks to significantly constrain development".	<b>6. Not Agreed.</b> The City Council supports the DNP and is not concerned that it will restrict their ability to deliver sustainable development within the rural area.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>7. Housing, Objectives-</b> "It is not acceptable to use such words as "appropriate" in relation to scale. This is open to mis-interpretation".	<b>7. Not agreed.</b> Certain scales of development are suitable in different areas. It is acceptable to aim that they are appropriate to different areas. Disagreement on the nature of appropriateness are to be worked out through the development management process, with each case considered on its own merit.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>8. H1-</b> "In the event of a lack of 5 year housing supply, the housing policies of the Neighbourhood Plan would be considered out of date..."	<b>8. Not agreed.</b> The policy reference is in the event of an anticipated lack of a 5 year land supply, allowing the Council time and opportunity to address this by searching for appropriate sites before a 5 year land supply can no longer be demonstrated. The reference should remain.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>9. H2-</b> "It is not understood why Raughton Head, Stockdalewath and Gaitsgill are in the Neighbourhood Plan as areas where new housing is supported but the more sustainable area of Buckabank/Bridge End/Hawksdale is not supported but is a sustainable location".	<b>9. Noted.</b> The areas of Buckabank, Bridge End, and Hawksdale are part of the village of Dalston outside the DBB and therefore Policy H1 applies.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>10. H3-</b> "This policy is considered incompatible with the drive to only enable small scale development which would not result in the provision of affordable housing.....".	<b>10. Not agreed.</b> This policy seeks to outline an approach to affordable/local needs housing. It is not directly concerned with provision or supply.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>11.JE2-</b> "Typical period for marketing is 12 months...". "The secondary part of JE2 is muddled and not clear..."	<b>11. Noted.</b> This policy has been amended to show 12 months. There is no reason why a policy of the Local Plan cannot be repeated within the DNP. However, for overall clarity this policy has been re-drafted and an additional policy added in this section.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>12.JE3d-</b> "Not clear why period of 25 years is appropriate"	<b>12. Noted.</b> This point has been deleted.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>13.JE3 part 2-</b> "Agricultural buildings are already covered in the Local Plan..."	<b>13. Noted.</b> as part of the re-drafting of this policy a new policy has been added for clarity. There is no reason why the DNP cannot repeat a policy of the Local Plan.
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>14. JE4-</b> "Improvements evidenced through transport statements or assessments are not simply to make a proposal acceptable to the community".	<b>14. Noted.</b> In a re-drafted policy "... to make proposals acceptable as evidenced by any transport statement or assessment", has been added. Reference "to the community" has been removed.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
45	cons	PFK - R. Lightfoot	<b>15.JE5.</b> "It is not the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan to implement CIL monies and this is considered to fail the appropriate tests."	<b>15. Not agreed.</b> The policy states that this would merely be considered as a potential source for CIL allocation, it is not actively seeking to implement them. It is not considered that this is contrary to the appropriate tests.
46	cons	Taylor & Hardy: Mr Coulthard	<b>1.</b> "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography.	<b>1. Noted.</b> The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is reliance on private cars to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
47	cons	Taylor & Hardy: ref. Cower	<b>1.</b> General restrictiveness of the settlement limit: Defined Development Boundary.	<b>1. Not Agreed.</b> The Local Plan does not identify any strategic housing sites within Dalston, and the City Council is able to currently demonstrate that it can meet its rural housing need with allocated sites across the District. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for windfall development in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan within the DDB. It also actively identifies other settlements within the Parish that could also support new development of an appropriate scale and nature, again in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan. Should the City Council be in a position that a deficit within its 5 year housing land supply is anticipated, then provision is included within the DNP to allow for searching in appropriate locations of the village for additional sites, as part of a wider District search, should they be required. In this context the DNP and the DDB are not considered to be contrary to the NPPF or the Local Plan.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
47	cons	Taylor & Hardy: ref. Cover	2. "...regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area.."	<b>2 Noted.</b> The NP forms part of the Development Plan for the District - policies in the Local Plan (HE 7) and the NPPF specifically seek to protect the integrity of conservation areas. These still apply, as part of the development plan, alongside the DNP. Beyond this, certain policies within the DNP seek to add further detail - the design policy, the boundary wall policy, and the landscape policy.
50	cons	Savills-Jen Hadland: Church Commissioners	<p>1. <b>SP1f</b> ".. Flood risk zones which could cause confusion with regard to future planning applications."</p> <p>2. <b>Policy H2</b></p> <p>3. <b>Proposed new site</b></p> <p>4. <b>JE2</b> "The proposed timeframe for marketing is considered overly onerous."</p> <p>5. <b>JE3 s1d</b> "The 25 years age requirement on a building is considered too onerous."</p> <p>6. <b>JE4</b> " It is requested that further clarification on this policy is provided concerning viability.</p> <p>7. <b>E2</b> "It is requested that we are kept informed regarding the Local Heritage Assets List proposed as part of the Plan.</p>	<p>1. <b>Noted.</b> The NP Steering Group has considered the flood issue. The policy has been amended to ensure greater clarity and conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>2. <b>Support noted.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Proposed new site noted.</b> The DNP Steering Group would welcome the opportunity to discuss in the future if need be.</p> <p>4. <b>Noted.</b> This policy has been amended to show 12 months.</p> <p>5. <b>Noted.</b> The 25 year requirement has been deleted.</p> <p>6. <b>Noted.</b> Additional text has been added to this policy to reflect its conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p>7. <b>Noted.</b></p>



Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
52	cons	Taylor & Hardy - Julie Diamond	1. The Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan does not comply with the conditions required of a NP...."	<p><b>1. Not Agreed.</b> The Local Plan does not identify any strategic housing sites within Dalston, and the City Council is able to currently demonstrate that it can meet its rural housing need with allocated sites across the District. The Neighbourhood Plan allows for windfall development in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan within the DDB. It also actively identifies other settlements within the Parish that could also support new development of an appropriate scale and nature, again in line with Policy HO 2 of the Local Plan. Should the City Council be in a position that a deficit within its 5 year housing land supply is anticipated, then provision is included within the NP to allow for searching in appropriate locations of the village for additional sites, as part of a wider District search, should they be required. In this context the NP and the DDB are not considered to be contrary to the NPPF or the Local Plan.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
3	Gen	Edwin Leslie,	<p>1. "From the draft Neighbourhood Plan, the main areas like the environment, business areas, the economy and sense of well-being are well covered".</p> <p>2. "The draft's main problem seems to be housing, particularly the idea of affordable homes for young residents. There is no house that is affordable for the young unless a housing association is willing to supply houses for a cheap rent. The other aspect of housing is the idea that infilling of houses should be allowed in some areas, but infilling is open to being abused by property developers to allow for further expansion which destroys the idea of a village".</p> <p>3. "...in the centre of Dalston is the Square and it provides a focal point which gives the illusion of a village. The value of St. Michael's church, the new library and Church House for worship and for social purposes are important. Likewise the Blue Bell and shops".</p> <p>4. "The Victory Hall brings people to the centre, and thereby the whole social fabric serves the community and should not be changed".</p>	<p>1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.</p> <p>2. The DDB is there to manage infill development in Dalston village in the best interests of the residents</p> <p>3. <b>Acknowledged.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Acknowledged.</b></p>
10	Gen	Linsay Cowan,	<p>1. "The wording of the Vision statement varies in different parts of the Draft Plan. I feel this should be consistent throughout".</p> <p>2. "<b>Overview.</b> Bridge End and Buckabank are most certainly part of Dalston Village!"</p> <p>3. "<b>Strategic Objectives. a to e agree. f.</b> Suggested amendment "To protect and where appropriate enhance...". <b>g.</b> I don't understand this sentence. Does it mean "To support the local economy through its existing businesses and encourage appropriate new enterprises and facilities which give employment opportunities"? <b>h.</b> Big ask but agree".</p>	<p>1. <b>Noted.</b> - Draft amended</p> <p>2. <b>Noted.</b> - Draft has been amended</p> <p>3. <b>a - h - Noted.</b></p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
10	Gen	Linsay Cowan,	<p><b>4.</b> "Strategic Principles. a, c, d, e, g, agree.h. Agree. Is there a definition of essential infrastructure?</p> <p><b>4. b.</b> Agree with the principle to retain Dalston as a distinct settlement from Carlisle. Don't agree with drawing a line at "the railway line". Whilst it may seem an opportune line to take it restricts the opportunity to allow, if necessary in future, development in areas along the main road and Station Road, attached to the village and handy for public transport. Also it is possible that the Southern Ring Road may be built and if it follows the line just south of Low Mill as previously suggested that could allow some development between it and the railway line. It is just as important to retain the rural identity of the village to the east, south and west.</p> <p><b>4. f.</b> Mitigation measures can be taken when developing within flood risk areas and flood assessments are now necessary. Whilst not supporting development in areas designated as sacrificial flood plains, I feel that this principle rules out large areas of the village that would naturally be potentially suitable for development without allowing some consideration of individual flood risk assessments. For example, later in the Draft Plan there is recognition that some infill would be suitable along the B5299 to the south of the village, which is a flood risk zone".</p>	<p><b>4. a, b,c,d,e,g,h Noted.</b></p> <p><b>4.b. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>4.f Noted.</b> This policy has been amended for greater clarity. "Flood risk zones 2 &amp; 3: Inappropriate development will not be supported in these areas. (See the "Dalston Village flood plain information map....)"</p>
10	Gen	Linsay Cowan,	<p><b>5. "Policies: Housing Objectives. 1. Agree. 2. Agree.</b>This is a sweeping statement and potentially leaves the Parish open to excess demands for development in future in order to fill the perceived need. There is a challenge to all communities, especially those seen as "popular" (as Dalston village and Parish is) in ensuring the continuity of the range of facilities and vibrancy that we currently enjoy by having housing for the full range of ages. I think that, certainly in Dalston village, that is now in place. There are many bungalows and a good mix of different size (and therefore priced) houses. A challenge with infilling is to continue that mix rather than just large "executive" style (and price) houses. This is being successfully achieved, I feel, next to the Victory Hall at present".</p>	<p><b>5.1 &amp; 2. Noted.</b> It is the objective of the Plan to respond to the future housing needs of the Parish.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
10	Gen	Lindsay Cowan,	<p><b>6. "Policies: H1. Agree with Defined Development Boundary statement.</b> However, whilst understanding that the Plan has to address the possibility of being asked by the District to accept development outside the DDB and agreeing that identifying specific areas/fields is not acceptable, I strongly disagree with limiting potential development to the west of the main village. Bridge End and Buckabank for example, as part of the village, have potential for small scale appropriately designed development. Outside of Dalston village, I feel there is scope for small scale housing developments in some of the smaller communities, for example Raughtonhead, Unthank, Orton Grange.</p> <p>Dalston village has recently accepted the insertion of a large number of new houses and therefore people. 76 of the 121 houses on The Grange estate are now occupied and the additional vehicular and people traffic is already noticeable. Having lived in the village all of my 61 years, I know that new housing developments over the years have ensured the retention and increase in facilities and services. However, the infrastructure has a finite capacity. United Utilities have stated that there is no more capacity at the sewerage works, the roads are very busy, the car parks are full, there are people all over the place! There is very little chance of numbers of increased employment opportunities in the village to justify further housing. There is no sign of the new roundabout at Station Road end or the traffic calming measures that are part of the planning approval for The Grange development and therefore there is no guarantee that promises made to improve infrastructure will be met in future either. Dalston needs to remain a village!</p>	6. Noted.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
10	Gen	Linsay Cowan,	<p><b>6.2</b> A definition of rural exception housing is needed. Surely Dalston village has done its bit. Any further development outside the DDB before the end of 2030 should be strongly resisted IF the suggestion is made that the Parish has to accept more housing or developers try to override the Plan and I support the work that has gone into this Neighbourhood Plan in order to give the Parish more say.</p>	<p><b>6.2</b> A definition of rural Exception Sites is available in Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, Policy HO 5</p>
			<p><b>7. "Policies: H2. Agree".</b>  <b>8. "Policies: H3. Agree.</b> 1 month is not sufficient time for people with a local connection to find out that the property is for sale...."  <b>9. "Policies: H4. Agree".</b>  <b>10. "Jobs: Objectives. Agree."</b>  <b>11. "Jobs: Policies, JE1.</b> Suggest in order to protect greenfield sites that "development on greenfield sites will not be supported. The Mill at Ellers Mill should be identified as a primary employment area."  <b>12."Jobs: Policies, JE2. Agree,</b> but 24 hours is too long a time for a commercial premises to have to be advertised and therefore probably be empty, I feel".  <b>13. "Jobs: Policies, JE3 to JE6 Agree".</b>  <b>14. "Protecting our Environment: Objective. Agree".</b>  <b>15. "Protecting our Environment: Policies, E1, E2 &amp; E4. Agree.</b>  <b>16."Protecting our Environment: Policies, E3.</b> Not sure why this subject needs a separate Policy. Whilst I am a supporter of renewable energy, it is usually controversial with residents and should not necessarily be given special development status in the Plan.    <b>17."Protecting our Environment: Policies, E5. Agree.</b> Suggest the riverside walks areas to the west of the river Caldew in Dalston village between Bridge End and The Green are added as Local Green Spaces.  <b>18. "THANK YOU FOR THE WORK THAT HAS BEEN PUT IN BY THE STEERING GROUP"</b></p>	<p><b>7. Noted.</b>  <b>8. Noted.</b> However one month is the aged standard for this type of housing situation.    <b>9. Noted.</b>  <b>10. Noted.</b>  <b>11.</b> Policy JE 1 supports commercial development on the existing primary employment sites and conforms to Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, Policy EC 2  <b>12. Noted.</b> Policy JE 2 has been modified to 12 months meeting normal commercial marketing needs.    <b>13. Noted.</b>  <b>14. Noted.</b>  <b>15. Noted.</b>  <b>16. Noted.</b> There is strong support from residents in the Visions Survey for renewable energy, specifically Hydro from rivers and streams, and farm slurry. However, this policy has been amended to improve clarity and conforms to the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, Policy CC3    <b>17. Noted.</b> Local Green Spaces will be re-visited in the next review of the Plan.    <b>18. Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your comprehensive review of the Plan.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
21	Gen	Doreen Hallsworth,	"What is 'affordable' housing. ?? ... the term is open to interpretation. It is ambiguous, non descriptive and depressing.	<b>Noted.</b> Affordable housing is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. From April 2012 affordable housing is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (prior to this the definitions in Planning Policy Statement 3 apply).
22	Gen	David Brookes,	Broadly supportive of the parish plan. However, the boundary of the Showfield as shown on the attached plan, should be re-drawn as the two small parcels of land adjacent to the Bowling Green form part of my garden.	We agree that one of the maps showing Local Green Spaces (LGS 07) has a drafting error as you say. This has been amended on the final version. Thank you for your interest and support of the Plan and we apologise for any inconvenience this may have caused.
23	Gen	John North,	Very good news. I can support this plan completely and wish you the best of luck. A plan can do wonders.	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.
24	Gen	Carol Douglas,	A resident living in The Square states that parking near her home is more and more difficult and is dismayed to find the situation has not been improved despite all the additional parking provided over the years	<b>Noted.</b> This is outside the direct scope of the Plan. Thank you for your interest in the Plan.
25	Gen	Stewart and Jenny Hudson,	"Looks good on paper – we now just need the local and national planners to take note of local opinion and act on it - this is long overdue, however history shows otherwise."	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
28	Gen	John Atkinson,	<p><b>1.</b>"This seems a positive step forward in ensuring that the housing development in Dalston and its satellite communities is appropriate and fitting as well as identifying those areas that need protection."</p> <p><b>2.</b> "Surprise. There is no substantive mention of traffic flows and its effect on housing."</p> <p><b>3.</b> "The extreme volume and speed of traffic mitigates against the rural designation of Dalston."</p> <p><b>4.</b> The respondent goes on to mention large industrial vehicles crossing narrow bridges such as Hawkesdale and negotiating double bends such as those at Buckabank. He had assumed that traffic would be a feature of any development considerations, and controlling or re routing traffic that should be using other routes designed for such through traffic should be a feature of any development plan.</p> <p><b>5.</b> "The road through the village also suffers from high traffic volume and speed. Schools, field entrances, restricted vision junctions all carry an element of risk especially for increasing number of elderly and the very young."</p>	<p><b>1. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>2.</b> When developing the Plan the Steering Group studied the Dalston traffic surveys from the past 3 years. Policy DNP-JE 4 addresses these issues managing any potential increase in commercial vehicles related to new industrial development. Parking and domestic traffic levels are beyond the scope of the Plan. however Dalston Parish Council and Cumbria County Council are working together to deal with these issues.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Plan.</p>



Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
29	Gen	David Wilson,	<p>1. "Congratulations on this draft."</p> <p>2. "Dalston should be protected from urban style traffic lights, roundabouts and light pollution."</p> <p>3. "There should be no more generic off-the-shelf estate designs: these detract from the architectural integrity and interest of the village adding no distinctiveness."</p> <p>4. "Should the DDB be redrawn to exclude the cemetery and land around St. Michael's Church?"</p> <p>5. "The inclusion of the Story estate of 121 houses in the conservation area is illogical and shows that the LPA reneged on its published commitment to "preserve and enhance" Conservation Areas".</p> <p>6. "There should be a presumption against development within the Conservation Area outside Dalston Village Centre."</p> <p>7. "Could the strip of riverside land on the opposite side of the river from LGS 56 also be designated as LGS also perhaps the land opposite and to the north of LGS05 and 55."</p> <p>8. "Any correction to projected district wide shortfall in the 5 year housing land supply should be shared throughout Carlisle district. Dalston should not suffer more than its fair share of development (The 121 development was approved even when there was no shortfall."</p>	<p><b>1. Acknowledged. Thanks.</b></p> <p><b>2. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>3. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>4. Noted.</b> The cemetery is already protected land and therefore does not need to be within the DDB.</p> <p><b>5. Noted</b></p> <p><b>6. Noted</b></p> <p><b>7. Noted.</b> These pieces of land are already protected as they either belong to the Parish or are protected as common land. However, Local Green Spaces will be re-visited in the next review of the Plan.</p> <p><b>8. Noted.</b> There is a presumption that a District wide shortfall will be serviced by a district wide share out of extra development. Policy H 1 .1 must still be satisfied thus restricting any such development as "proportionate to the size and scale of the village.</p>
30	Gen	Margaret Jones,	"I like the Parish Council plan to make The Square a seating area at a cost of £300,000. It would contribute a chatty area and make Dalston a healthier, happier and hopeful community".	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
31	Gen	Olga Lytollis,	<p>1. "The volume of traffic coming through Buckabank into the village has increased significantly since the new bypass. We have noticed more heavy plant and machinery coming through."</p> <p>2. "Should there be a weight restriction on the bridge at Bridge End especially with the volume of water under the bridge."</p> <p>3. "We feel Dalston is losing its identity as a village due to the number of new houses being built (not many affordable to young residents of the village. It feels that Dalston is becoming a suburb of Carlisle."</p> <p>4. "Can the schools, doctors' practice, roads etc cope with this continued "creeping development."</p>	<p>1. <b>Noted.</b> When developing the Plan the Steering Group studied the Dalston traffic surveys from the past 3 years. Policy DNP-JE 4 addresses these issues managing any potential increase in commercial vehicles related to new industrial development.</p> <p>2. <b>Noted.</b> This issue is beyond the scope of the Plan.</p> <p>3. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Noted.</b> Other policies in the Plan and the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 should ensure that infra-structure and services are provided to deal with these issues.</p>
32	Gen	Jane Brazendale,	"An excellent document beautifully presented and well thought through."	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.
33	Gen	Peggy Jackson,	<p>1. "I live in the centre of the village and am concerned about the great increase of traffic going through."</p> <p>2. "The Bakery will be closing after Christmas and will be a big loss to the whole neighbourhood"</p> <p>3. "Plant more trees."</p>	<p>1. <b>Noted.</b> When developing the Plan the Steering Group studied the Dalston traffic surveys from the past 3 years. Policy DNP-JE 4 addresses these issues managing any potential increase in commercial vehicles related to new industrial development.</p> <p>2. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Noted.</b></p>
34	Gen	John Kelsey,	1. "Re Appendix 2 and Appendix 3, why the important issue relating to flooding that applies to three of the seven green spaces, 05, 55 and 56 and the Low Mill area has'nt been quoted as a rationale for the designation of LGSs. This also applies to LGS 07 following the recent flooding of the Victory Hall as without this green space many houses along The Green could well have been flooded as well. These should be in Appendix 3	<p>1. Flooding is a matter for the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.</p> <p>Designation of a Local Green space is not restricted due to potential flood risk.</p>
35	Gen	Terry Nichol,	<p>1. "I hope the plan is introduced and actually works."</p> <p>2. "There seems to be development with no consideration of what the people living in Dalston want at the moment. Stopping ribbon development and keeping the beautiful country around the villages is very important to me"</p>	<p>1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Thanks.</p> <p>2. <b>Noted.</b></p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
36	Gen	Sue Nichol,	<p>1. "Good plan. Well thought through. Hope there will be no delay in implementing plan. Would hope planners will listen to the people and avoid over development."</p> <p>2. "Hope it will put a stop to giving permission to build in unsuitable places in conservation areas"</p> <p>3. "Re Buckabank, houses would be better at bottom of hill above the "Rookery" than in dominant part of Buckabank (permission given in January 2016)"</p>	<p>1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Thanks.</p> <p>2. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Noted.</b></p>
37	Gen	Judith Wilson.	<p>1. "To protect the built character of the Parish there should be a presumption of repair and rehabilitation instead of demolition and replacement"</p> <p>2. "New build in Dalston should prefer imaginative truly original and energy saving modern architecture rather than generic and off the shelf pastiche structures. Similar conditions should also apply to extensions"</p> <p>3. "S106 and other conditions when agreed and set and agreed at the planning stage must be agreed to. Dummy chimneys and old barn wall on Story development not followed through."</p> <p>4. "Trees should be better protected – was it necessary to cut down and disfigure so severely two large trees in Buckabank".</p> <p>5. "Bushes and trees in the church yard have also been vulnerable"</p> <p>6. "Perhaps the plan should make clear an appropriate commitment to keep felling and cutting back to an absolute minimum for the sake of the environment".</p> <p>7. "Resist within the village environment inappropriate urban style traffic lights, crossings, roundabouts, road markings, street furniture and light pollution."</p>	<p>1. <b>Noted.</b> Policy H 2, "Justification" "...Conversions of redundant buildings can provide opportunities for new accommodation and / or commercial ventures. Proposed conversions will be supported...."</p> <p>2. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Noted.</b> The Neighbourhood Plan (Policy DNP- JE 3) and the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 (Policy EC 12) both have policies relating to trees.</p> <p>5. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>7. <b>Noted.</b> These issues are beyond the scope of the Plan.</p>
38	Gen	David and Molly Marsden,	<p>1. "We think this is an excellent well thought out plan and document."</p> <p>2. "We think that individual scattered dwellings should be actively discouraged in rural parts of the parish except for family requirement e.g. farmers for sons/daughters working on the farm".</p>	<p>1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Thanks.</p> <p>2. <b>Agreed.</b> The National Planning Policy Framework and the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, actively resist this type of development.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
39	Gen	Ian Turnbull,	<p>1. "Encourage houses of more modern design instead of mock Georgian".</p> <p>2. "Increase density of housing at Lingy if owners wish to sell part of gardens."</p> <p>3. "Improve appearance of approach to village by Station Road, fuel depot, too much paving on station approach".</p> <p>4. "Improve appearance of industrial-estate and its entrance."</p> <p>5. "Consider having roundabouts at north end of The Square and at Townhead Road. This would slow down traffic and could provide an attractive stop to The Square".</p> <p>6. "Reconsider design and layout of footways to Co-op, car parks, bank, toilets etc".</p>	<p><b>1. Noted.</b> Dalston Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) Policy DNP-SP1 applies.</p> <p><b>2. Noted.</b> Lingey is outside the DDB and therefore DNP Policy DNP- H1 and Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, Policy HO 5 apply.</p> <p><b>3. Noted.</b> Outside the remit of the Plan.</p> <p><b>4. Noted.</b> Outside the remit of the Plan.</p> <p><b>5. Noted</b> A highways issue and therefore outside the remit of the Plan.</p> <p><b>6. Noted.</b> Outside the remit of the Plan.</p>
40	Gen	Cathy Oakley,	<p>1. "Who set the DDB? Can't see the reason for some of these specific areas. Appreciate the aim of limiting development (prevent sprawl) but rumours abound of other areas liable to be targeted."</p> <p>2. "What about the Mill factory site? Not attractive at the moment —underutilised brown site that could benefit from redevelopment".</p> <p>3. "Hawkesdale not within the conservation area. This could sustain some building – left hand side going out of the village".</p> <p>4. "LGS 07 is marked a green space yet the DDB goes around it –if it is green then it can't be built on. The red lines should continue straight behind the houses/gardens".</p> <p>5. "Field at back of Ben Hodgson's garage – Important river boundary, significant green space; hope planning permission is never given for this site".</p>	<p><b>1. Noted.</b> The DDB was set taking into account the results of the "Visions" survey and its intention is to prevent sprawl.</p> <p><b>2. Noted. Policy JE 1 applies.</b></p> <p><b>3. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>4. Noted.</b> You are correct. Areas outside the DDB are protected against development and the draft drawing reflects the status of the proposed Local Green Spaces. If these LGSs are adopted then the DDB in this area will be suitably amended to reflect this.</p> <p><b>5. Noted.</b> This site is outside the DDB so when the Plan is adopted development here will not normally be allowed.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
41	Gen	Cathy Oakley,	<p>1. "Thanks to all the Parish Councillors who have worked had on this Neighbourhood Plan, it is vey well presented".</p> <p>2. "Is the flood risk zone the same as the flood plain"?</p> <p>3. "Strong rumour that land between Popples and 48 The Green is the next target area"</p> <p>4. "Also same for Brough's field at top of Buckabank but neither of these sites are within the DDB".</p>	<p>1. Acknowledged. Thank you for your interest in the Plan.</p> <p>2. <b>Yes.</b> They are the same in the context of the Plan. Flood Risk Zones can include a flood plain but go beyond.</p> <p>3. <b>Noted.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Noted.</b></p>
49	Gen	Greg and Sandra Denwood,	"We have read through the Plan and consider that it is comprehensive in its coverage of the issues relevant to the future of the Parish. We agree with the proposed policies to guide future development and would support the adoption of the Plan. We would like to thank all those who have worked so hard to produce it."	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.
60	Gen	Ian Rousell,	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the Parish Council who have worked so hard to draw this draft Neighbourhood Plan together. I would also like to thank all those members who have attended and been so helpful at the consultation meetings.</p> <p>1. <b>Environmental Audits.</b> "Does the Parish Council have/hold these?" "Environmental Management Plans. The village green is a prime example. How is the woodland and grassland managed to ensure the diversity of animals and plants ? Should we be creating more wildlife habitats? How is the public informed about the wildlife and how does the Council seek to maintain it? Cumbria Wildlife Trust and The Environmental Agency are listed in the introduction to the entry by village to the "Britain in Bloom" competition. So we have the foundations for developing audits and plans for the future. f) To protect and enhance the natural and built environment of the Parish, including its landscape, geological assets [Cardewlees Quarry], built heritage, archaeological sites and wild-life habitats.</p> <p>Could these be included as examples of built heritage/ archaeological sites?</p>	<p><b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your response to the draft of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan. Your detailed approach is appreciated, as are your complimentary comments.</p> <p>1. <b>Environmental Audits. Noted.</b> The Parish Council does, as you say, have the foundation for producing such audits and there is already a detailed audit of the Church Yard, especially the slow worm habitat and the common land at Nook Lane Foot. Your comment on the management of The Green is welcome. The Green is designated as a Local Green Space in The Plan and the other areas are protected due to their intrinsic nature. Therefore these audits do not come within the remit of the Plan, which deals primarily with land use with regard to development. These observations are valuable and will be passed on to the Parish Council.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
60	Gen	Ian Rousell	<p><b>2. Chalk Quarries.</b> Chalk Quarries and the Lime kilns and quarries at Chalk Quarries. Following a recent survey by Dr. David Johnston and Alison Armstrong on 22nd September 2016 the enclosed field survey has been produced. It states, referring to a lime kiln, "It is also very unusual for Cumbria in having twin bowls as well as four draw arches: for this reason it should not be lost completely. "This site fits all the criteria for inclusion in this category and as a "Green Space Site". The sandstone retaining walls and small weir to the north of the main weir at Bridge End. This stone work makes the mill race possible.</p> <p><b>3. The River Caldew.</b> 50 metres is a very small distance in terms of such an important river. How will the river bank be defined? Recent erosion has changed the width of the river in many places. "A minimum of' would give the Council more control over the actual distance required. How does the Environmental Agency view any development next to the Caldew?</p>	<p><b>2. Chalk Quarries.</b> Noted. This area is not within the remit of The Plan and your interesting research has been passed on to the Parish Council for further action. Should those parts which fall within the Parish be nationally listed they will have automatic protection. If not, they can be added to a Local Asset List. Similar action applies to the sandstone retaining walls and small weir to the north of the main weir at Bridge End as they could be regarded as examples of Dalston's industrial heritage. These features are on privately owned land.</p> <p><b>3. The River Caldew.</b> Noted. The river and its banks are given special protection as an SSSI and an SAC. The banks in Dalston are also common land which affords further protection. Erosion is outside the remit of this Plan. The Environment Agency consider 8 metres is a sufficient distance for protection. The Plan has been modified to reflect this.</p>
60	Gen	Ian Rousell,	<p><b>4. Flood risk zones.</b> Should consideration also be given to the implications of developments in the immediate rainfall stream/river catchment areas of flood risk zones? The village hall lies at a low point in the flood plain and was flooded twice in 2016. Developments on higher land to the south, which can be protected against flooding, will impede the natural drainage of ground water, as a result of which a great volume of "flood "water could flow into the potential flood zone. That is unless adequate drainage of the flood zone can be guaranteed.</p> <p><b>5. Local green spaces.</b> Map 2 page 37: I am surprised that the land between Hawksdale Bridge and the Union/ Dalston Bridge, to the west of the river, has not been included. It has the same values as LGSSG. This is a valuable part of the "wildlife corridor" between Hawksdale Bridge and the White Bridge.</p>	<p><b>4. Flood risk zones. Noted.</b> See the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 2030.</p> <p><b>5. Local Green Spaces. Noted.</b> The land you highlight between Hawksdale Bridge and the White Bridge, is as you say, a vital area for wildlife and the river bank landscape. This is common land, and managed by The Parish Council and comes under their protection. Its status will be reassessed in the five-year plan review.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
60	Gen	Ian Rousell,	<p><b>6.</b> Hawksdale Bridge to "The Bay". The land to the north side has a public footpath running through it and enables the public to view the sluice gate which is used to control the water levels in the mill race and the mini-weir used to return surplus water to the river. The land to the south has no public right of way over it, but is used by dog walkers and youngsters from the village who swim in the Caldew at The Bay in summer months.</p> <p><b>7.</b> Road safety "...Business development in the area without adequate planning for car parking has resulted in parked cars obstructing the passage of traffic, and pedestrians over the bridge. The reduction of the speed limit to 30mph will help. Whilst many people may not like to see double yellow lines all over the place, it may be the only solution."</p>	<p><b>6.</b> Hawksdale Bridge to "The Bay". Noted. This land is privately owned and Policy H1 will apply.</p> <p><b>7.</b> Road safety. Noted. We acknowledge the real concern regarding this problem. Efforts to minimise traffic volumes are contained in The Development Principles and the policies within the Plan.</p>
2	LGS	Dalston Recreation Association,	<p><b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 07 The Showfield:</b> "...the area to the west of the Recreation football field is shown as part of The Showfield. ...this is actually owned by the Recreation Association. As such we would ask for this area be excluded from this Green space Area".</p>	<p><b>Noted. DNP-LGS 07</b> has been amended to show this area correctly.</p>
2A	LGS	Dalston Recreation Association,	<p><b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 59 The Bowling Green &amp; Recreation Ground:</b> "... are quite agreeable to the entire Recreation Area being included in the Dalston Green Spaces Zones."</p>	<p><b>Acknowledged. DNP-LGS 59</b> has been amended to include the area mentioned in your letter of 17th October 2016 as part of the Bowling Green &amp; Recreation Ground Local Green Space.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Plan.</p>
2B	LGS	Dalston Bowling Club,	<p><b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 59 The Bowling Green &amp; Recreation Ground:</b> No reply received from this group! Letter sent 14th Feb 2017. Reply by 28th March 2017. (6 weeks consultation)</p>	<p>As no reply received it is taken that there is no objection for this area to become a LGS.</p>



Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
14	LGS	Dalston Agricultural Society,	<p><b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 07 The Showfield:</b>..We object to LGS Designation on the following grounds:</p> <p><b>1. Hampering future investment;</b> "Dalston Show is a widely recognised part of the very fabric of the village..." The Dalston Agricultural Society has in recent years invested heavily in the showfield site to improve it for use as a showfield, this includes the installation of hard tracks and fresh water facilities. The hard tracks would not have been allowed to be installed under the Green Open Spaces designation yet are vital on poor weather days for the safe functioning of the Show. This investment was made possible by leasing some of the land for a car park to the adjoining Co-op store, again this development would not have been allowed under the designation and the Dalston Agricultural Society would then not have had the funds available to make the investment into the site to ensure its continued success."</p> <p><b>2. Incorrect statements</b> within the Draft Plan, "The site is not held in trust for public recreational use but is held by the Trustees of Dalston Agricultural Society...to promote the advancement of agriculture for the benefit of the public by holding an annual show at Dalston";</p> <p><b>3.</b>Incorrectly identified plan; "The plan as drawn, incorrectly identifies the land which could be classed as Green Open Space, part of the land has been developed into a car park and therefore could not be designated in this way."</p> <p><b>4.</b> Lack of consultation: "Planning Practice Guidance states that the local planning authority or qualifying body should contact owners at an early stage about the proposals to designate part of their land as Local Green Space. This we consider not to have been done, the committee were first made aware of the proposal on ad-hoc inspection of the proposed plan by committee members.</p>	<p>The DNP Steering Group stated that The Showfield provided high local/community value in terms of agricultural, recreational and cultural values to a large percentage of the residents of Dalston Parish as evidenced in the "Dalston Visions" survey.</p> <p><b>1. The following</b> paragraphs in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) show that exceptions are allowed within Green Belts and therefore Local Green Spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPPF paragraph 78 – <i>Local Green Space policy should be consistent with policy for Green Belts</i> – Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 2030 does not have a Green Belt policy , so this would go back up the chain to the NPPF policy on Greenbelts.</li> <li>NPPF paragraph 89 – Exceptions to the general ban on new buildings in the Green Belt include, amongst other things, <i>"provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it"</i>.</li> </ul> <p>It is the opinion of Carlisle District Council Planning that any development on this land that was considered an improvement of the facility would be allowed. This would include additional roadways and appropriate ancillary buildings (toilet block) to be built subject to normal planning and building control considerations.</p> <p><b>2. The site description</b> has been amended to Appendix 3 in the Plan.</p> <p><b>3. The plan for DNP-LGS 07 The Showfield</b> has been amended to show the Co-op car park as a non designated area of the LGS.</p> <p><b>4.</b> All landowners of the proposed Local Green Spaces in the Plan were informed by letter 3 - 5 days before the Consultation period. It was expected that this communication would start the dialogue between the DNP Steering Group and the landowner.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
14	LGS	Dalston Agricultural Society,	<p>On challenge to the Parish Council as to why consultation with Dalston Agricultural Society had not taken place they stated they had in fact consulted but on production of the letter of consultation, the address was shown to be incorrect.</p> <p>5. Designation of Dalston Showfield as Green Open space has been poorly considered and will have a deep impact on the future viability of the Show Society.</p>	<p>The Dalston Agricultural Society was not informed at this time due to an incorrect address used for its correspondence. This error was brought to the notice of the DNP Steering Group at the "Drop in" public meeting held on 22nd September 2016, 19 days after the start of the consultation. In light of this error the Steering Group allowed the Dalston Agricultural Society an extension to the Consultation period of three weeks to ensure that they had the full 6 weeks consideration time.</p> <p>5. The Dalton Agricultural Society was invited to a meeting of the DNP Steering Group to discuss these issues on 7th February 2017. The main issues stated above were discussed including a compromise situation where a part of the Showfield would not be designated LGS. This compromise was suggested by the Steering Group to accomodate any further minor development seen as necessary by the Dalston Agricultural Society to maintain a viable future for The Showfield.</p> <p>The two members of the Dalston Agricultural Society present would report this discussion back to their full committee and give a formal reply to the Steering Group in due course.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
14 B	LGS	Dalston Agricultural Society,	<p>Last evening we had a well attended meeting of the Dalston Agricultural Society at which time the trustees were left in no doubt regarding the Society's view of your proposals. Committee members subsequently instructed the Trustees to prepare a submission and agreed adequate funding for appropriate professional support.</p> <p>I therefore detail below our concerns and objections to the proposals by Dalston Parish Council to designate our Show Field as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Firstly may we correct Appendix 3: of your Consultation Draft under reference LGS 07.</p> <p>Our Show Field is not and at no time in the past, has been a site for "recreation". The field is for agricultural use only and on one day in the year hosts the Dalston Agricultural Show. The field is held in trust, with trustees empowered to execute the Society's constitution of promoting Agriculture. The trustees are not empowered to provide a site for "public recreational use" as stated in your Plan.</p> <p><b>1. We consider it appropriate at this point to state the 'objects' contained within our constitution and which binds our trustees: The encouragement and general advancements of the science and practice of Agriculture in its widest sense including the breeding and rearing of livestock, the invention and improvement of agricultural implements and machinery and the encouragement of skill and industry husbandry and the promotion of rural crafts and sporting activities. The consideration of all agricultural subjects of a non political character in the interest of those who depend upon the cultivation of the soil for their support.</b></p>	<p>The Dalston Agricultural Society Trustees were invited to a meeting of the DNP Steering Group to discuss the response from their members.</p> <p>A meeting with 5 of their Trustees was held on 28th April 2017. At an earlier meeting of the DNP Steering Group members had decided that the proposed LGS 07, Dalston Showfield would be removed from the Plan. This was communicated to the Trustees of Dalston Agricultural Society present.</p> <p>A wide ranging discussion then took place covering the future progress of the Plan and the following points.</p> <p><b>1. The DNP Steering Group noted these "objects" (part of The Dalston Agricultural Society Constitution) and support their intent. Further it was noted that Trustees of The Agricultural Society stated that with these "objects" in mind it was their intention to continue the usual operation of Dalston Showfield for the foreseeable future under the terms of their Trust.</b></p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
14 B	LGS	Dalston Agricultural Society,	<p>2. On the subject of access to our field, there remains no public access to the Show Field throughout the year, apart from Show Day on the second Saturday in August. There are no public footpaths or rights of way crossing the field.</p> <p>Your Council will be aware of the support given by the Agricultural Society to a number of Dalston groups and businesses throughout many years:</p> <p>The trustees gave authority for land to be transferred for a Doctors Surgery 40 years ago. Similarly for an Indoor Bowling Green.</p> <p>More recently, the development of the Cooperative supermarket would not have been possible had the Society not been prepared to lease land for a car park as required by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>None of these improvements to the village amenities would have been possible had your proposal for Local Green Space designation been in force at the time.</p> <p>The designation now proposed, if accepted by the Local Authority, would prevent all future development on our Show field, such as hard tracks, permanent toilets or water supply facilities.</p> <p>Equally we would be unable to support the expansion of those organisations listed above who have relied upon our land being available to them. There are also other groups such as the Victory Hall, Recreation Association and Tennis Club who may well require our support in the future.</p> <p>As you are aware our Agricultural Society has always been supportive of your Parish Council and the village of Dalston and is hopefully considered to be an asset. Our committee is made up of persons living and working within Dalston Parish and neighbouring parishes who labour tirelessly, maintaining the Show Field in a first class condition.</p>	<p>2. The DNP Steering Group commented that the issues raised concerning access to the Showfield have always been understood, respected and have never been disputed.</p> <p>The DNP Steering Group are disappointed that they have failed to convince The Dalston Agricultural Society in any way, that a Local Green Space would only enhance and never threaten the Trustees fundamental objectives. Therefore in the interests of continuing support and co-operation between Dalston Parish Council and The Dalston Agricultural Society this Steering Group will remove LGS 07 from the Plan.</p>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
14 B	LGS	Dalston Agricultural Society,	<p>We have invested considerable sums over recent years in the field infrastructure and are equally prepared to invest in the future for the benefit of all and if needs be to protect the current status of our land by whatever means might be necessary.</p> <p>We have endeavoured to work closely with yourselves for the benefit of Agriculture and the community and trust therefore that you will not consider our land appropriate for 'Local Green Space' designation for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>We confirm that it is our intention to attend your meeting on Friday the 28th April at 7.30pm, if this remains acceptable to you.</p> <p>At that time we will expand upon our objections and answer any questions which you may wish to present.</p>	

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	G
26	LGS	Anne Routledge,	<b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 55 The land between The Kingsway and The River Caldew:</b> Objection but land now sold to David Gray.	<b>Noted.</b>
27	LGS	Malcolm Wright,	<b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 18 Sowerby Wood (Forest):</b> Objection to LGS Designation. Reasons: <b>1.</b> Proximity to the community. Sowerby Forest is over 1 mile from Dalston village and not easily accessible from it. <b>2.</b> Significance to the local community. Sowerby Forest is a commercial woodland planted with young trees of no particular aesthetic value and is not a public space for either recreation or community activities. <b>3.</b> The area could not be described as being particularly local in nature and is in fact an extensive tract of land.  4. We would therefore request that you delete Sowerby Forest from the scope of the consultation.	<b>Noted.</b>  <b>1.</b> Sowerby Forest is accessible by direct footpath from Dalston village and is used by many residents walking their dogs in this area. <b>2.</b> It is accepted that the type of woodland has no aesthetic value to the residents other than being a peaceful place to walk though via the footpaths that cross it.  <b>3.</b> It is accepted that as a commercial forest plantation, Sowerby Forest could not be considered of local significance. Also Sowerby Forest is a large tract of land which is far larger than LGS legislation intended. <b>4. Consequently the DNP Steering group reluctantly agree with the owner that Sowerby Forest should be removed from the Plan as a Local Green Space.</b>
61	LGS	David Gray, David Gray	<b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 55 The land between The Kingsway and The River Caldew:</b> <b>Objection to LGS Designation.</b> Many thanks for your letter and for your continued good work. As I said at the meeting I have no intention of developing the land and was quite happy for a prohibitive overage clause to be included in the purchase agreement. However, there's no advantage (to me) in having the land classified as a 'Local Green Space', so unfortunately I object to the designation. I am concerned how this will be perceived (suspiciously by some) but who knows what the future holds. I have paid handsomely for the land and will be investing further money to mitigate the potential for flooding (of my house), repairing fences, planting trees etc all to preserve a Green Open Space so am reluctant to restrict its use or diminish its value.	The DNP Steering Group met with the landowner to discuss further. <b>See additional correspondence below, ref. 61A</b>

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
61 A	LGS	David Gray,	<p><b>Local Green Space DNP-LGS 55 The land between The Kingsway and The River Caldew:</b></p> <p>Thanks for your time last night.</p> <p>As discussed, I've attached a plan of the field showing the area that I'd be happy to designate as a Local Green Space – I've cut it off from the edge of the car park which seemed to be an obvious point, given that this space has already been 'urbanised'. I hope that this compromise will be acceptable to the committee.</p>	<p><b>Acknowledged.</b> The map, DNP-LGS 55 The land between The Kingsway and The River Caldew, has been amended to reflect these changes.</p> <p>The DNP Steering Group would like to thank David Gray for making this compromise, protecting the outlook of this central part of Dalston Village for its residents and visitors.</p>
8	Stat	Environment Agency,	<p>We fully agree and support your findings in the Screening Report that a full SEA is not required to be undertaken for the reason as set out in Section 4.1 of the report. We support the objectives set out in the Plan but would suggest that reference to the work that the 'Roe catchment Community Water Management Group' are doing in the research into what can be done in terms of natural flood management measures at Stockdalewath is included in the plan to support their objectives.</p>	Acknowledged.
13	Stat	Historic England,	<p>..."At this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area as you move towards referendum. The draft opinion prepared for your forum concludes that Strategic Environmental assessment is not required.</p>	Noted.
43	Stat	Natural England,	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this Draft Neighbourhood Plan and agrees with the conclusion of the Habitats Regulation Assessment that there will be no likely significant effect on the River Eden Special Area of Conservation.</p>	Acknowledged.



Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
44	stat	Carlisle City Council	Please find below Carlisle City Council's response to the consultation on the draft Dalston Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (DNP). The Council feels that the DNP steering group should be commended for their efforts on producing this Plan, which is on the whole well written and, from Carlisle City Council's point of view, generally appropriate. A number of comments have been compiled with input from various officers at the Council, including the Housing Development Officer, the Principal Development Management Officer, the Principal Planning Policy Officer, the Landscapes Architect/Tree Officer, and the Heritage Officer. These comments have been included to seek to improve the effectiveness of the DNP and to put forward suggestions with the potential to strengthen policies where appropriate. See Appendix 5: Carlisle City Council Consultation Response 2016.	<b>Acknowledged. All matters discussed and noted. See Appendix 5.</b>
53	Stat	Clerk to St. Cuthbert Without Parish council.	".... St Cuthbert Without Parish Council has resolved to submit that no comment was considered necessary on the Plan. Thank you for including the Parish Council within your consultation".	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you for your interest in the Plan.
54	Stat	Department for Communities & Local Government,	We have updated our national database to reflect the latest position of your plan and would like to wish you every success with its completion.	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Thank you.
55	Stat	Highways England, Lindsay	"I am pleased to inform you that Highways England has no objection to the Plan going forward."	Noted
56	Stat	Community Safety Unit North Cumbria Police Headquarters	The Community Safety Unit seeks to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour, primarily via our involvement with the planning process. The Carlisle and District Local Plan makes specific reference to crime reduction (Policy CP17) and we endeavour to influence developers to incorporate good security, promoting the Secured by Design initiative. We would therefore welcome Parish Council support in this objective.	Acknowledged.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
57	Stat	Health & Safety Executive,	We have concluded that we have no representations to make on this occasion. This is because our records show that the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan boundary and the land within does not encroach on the consultation zones of major hazard establishments or MAHPs. As no encroachment has been detected, HSE does not need to be informed of the next stages in the adoption of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan.	Acknowledged.
58	Stat	Cumbria Fire & Rescue Service,	Cumbria Fire & Rescue service at this moment in time have no observations to make in relation to the above topic, However, each application for Planning, Licensing, or Building control work will be processed in the normal manner according to the correct legislative procedure and time scale.	Noted
59	Stat	Sports England,	"...It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport in the NPPF para 73 & 74. ...it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in the Local Plan.	Acknowledged.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
1	Stock	Natasha and Sebastian Schmalz,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
4	Stock	Kay Robinson,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
5	Stock	Sandra D Holliday	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
6	Stock	Phillip Utting,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
7	Stock	Emily Pasons,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
9	Stock	Damian Woolfe,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
11	Stock	Elizabeth Luck,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
12	Stock	Felicity Coulthard,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
15	Stock	William Hogg,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
16	Stock	Paul Wren,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
17	Stock	David and Susan Black,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
18	Stock	Andrew Jones,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.

Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
19	Stock	Joan Carr,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
20	Stock	David and Brenda Green,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.
42	Stock	Peter Mason,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.



Ref.	Cat.	Organisation/Name	Comment	Steering Group Response
48	Stock	David and Helen Tucker,	1. "...inappropriate for Stockdalewath to be included in Policy H2 of the Draft Dalston Neighbourhood Plan due to flood risk, lack of sustainability and rising topography"	1. Noted: The NP Steering Group agree that Stockdalewath cannot be described as sustainable as there are no services nearby and there is a reliance on a private car to access these from the village of Dalston. However it can be argued that Stockdalewath acts as part of a cluster of hamlets supporting services in Dalston and the nearby Raughton Head School. A significant proportion of Stockdalewath is located within flood zones 2 and 3, also there are limited areas outside the flood zones due to the rising topography of the land that could be described as physically connected to the hamlet. It is agreed therefore that Stockdalewath will not be included in Policy DNP-H2.

## Appendix 5: Carlisle City Council Consultation Responses 2016

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
General Comment	Please find below Carlisle City Council's response to the consultation on the draft Dalston Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (DNP). The Council feels that the DNP Steering Group should be commended for their efforts on producing this Plan, which is on the whole well written and, from Carlisle City Council's point of view, generally appropriate.	
	A number of comments have been compiled with input from various officers at the Council, including the Housing Development Officer, the Principal Development Management Officer, the Principal Planning Policy Officer, the Landscapes Architect/Tree Officer, and the Heritage Officer. These comments have been included to seek to improve the effectiveness of the DNP and to put forward suggestions with the potential to strengthen policies where appropriate.	
The Vision	We note and support the Plan's vision, though would suggest that it could be more effective if it sought to be more descriptive and set out how the Parish wants the area to look and be in the future. For example, the Carlisle District Local Plan starts its vision by highlighting what the Council would like Carlisle District to be like in 2030. This may be an approach the Steering Group could consider for the DNP Vision.	Noted. The Vision has been re-drafted to reflect the future aspirations of the Plan.

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Overview of Dalston Parish	<p>The overview of the Parish is considered to be helpful. Whilst there are no fundamental issues with this section, some minor concerns include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reference to Bridge End is not clear – what does ‘almost an extension’ mean. Either it is, or it isn’t part of Dalston village. Suggest removing this reference, and starting the sentence “Bridge End has a variety....”</li> <li>2. Reference to large house being built in Unthank is an odd reference to single out for a neighbourhood plan. Suggest deleting it, particularly given that this is a long term plan and therefore this reference is likely to be irrelevant within 5 or so years’ time.</li> <li>3. The overview mentions several settlements, but only four of these are highlighted on the preceding map.</li> <li>4. The Parish of Dalston does not lie ‘adjacent’ to the National Park – this should be corrected to something more accurate, such as ‘close to’.</li> <li>5. Reference to the barn at Town Head Road doesn’t seem to make sense – this needs to be better integrated into the text of the Plan.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledged. For clarity, redrafted; "Bridge End is part of Dalston village..."</li> <li>2. Acknowledged. Removed the whole sentence and now reads, "It is a rural farming settlement including two farms."</li> <li>3. Noted. Most of the small settlements mentioned in the overview are not sustainable in their current form. The four mentioned are the larger hamlets that could play a major role in the future of the Parish.</li> <li>4. Acknowledged. For clarity, redrafted; "Dalston Parish, which is close to the Lake District National Park,...."</li> <li>5. Acknowledged. Removed.</li> </ol>
Strategic Objectives	<p>The objectives in the DNP are supported, with only some minor comments included below to seek an improvement in clarity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective a) delete the term ‘small in’ scale, refer instead to ‘of an appropriate scale for its location’ – this would provide more positive wording whilst still achieving the desired effect.</li> <li>2. Objective b) does not make grammatical sense. It perhaps needs additional wording inserted after ‘Dalston Village...’</li> <li>3. Objective c) needs to be made clear that this applies to development in settlements other than Dalston, rather than just saying development outside of the DDB, otherwise it contradicts objective b).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Text amended.</li> <li>2. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Text amended.</li> <li>3. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Text amended.</li> </ol>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Strategic Policy SP1	<p>Policy SP 1 is supported, however, more significant concerns include:</p> <p><b>1. Criteria e.</b> reference to 50m exclusion zone – it is not clear what evidence or justification this is based on? Typically the Environment Agency would request an area of 8m be protected from development either side of a main river to allow for maintenance. A 50m exclusion zone would not be required to protect the integrity of the river as an SAC or SSSI, instead development proposals near to the river should be assessed on their own merit. It is recommended that this paragraph concludes after "... strictly protected."</p> <p><b>2. Criteria f.</b> is currently contrary to the NPPF. It is vague and does not specify what flood zones it would apply to – presumably not Flood Risk Zone 1, which is areas of low to no risk of flooding (though still technically a flood risk zone). It does not account for flood compatible development, for sequential and exceptions testing or for possible mitigation measures. Suggest not mentioning flooding in the Strategic Policy as it is already covered in significant detail in the Local Plan and in the NPPF and supporting documents.</p> <p><b>3. Criteria h.</b> is considered to need further clarification. It is currently too ambiguous and could potentially benefit from clarifying whether it applies to all development or just housing. It is recommended that reference to the Neighbourhood Area is replaced with reference instead to the Parish as this would be the more familiar term to the public.</p>	<p><b>1. Acknowledged.</b> For clarity and following the Environment Agency guidance this point has been amended as suggested.</p> <p><b>2. Acknowledged.</b> For clarity and to be compatible with the NPPF and Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 2030, this point has been amended and shortened. It is considered necessary to include this flood risk view in the Strategic Policy due to areas of high risk within Dalston Parish that must not be ignored.</p> <p><b>3. Acknowledged.</b> For clarity this point has been amended to reference directly to "Dalston Village" which is where the DDB functions.</p>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Strategic Policy SP1 Minor comments	<p><b>4.</b> Criteria b. needs to change reference to Dalston Village rather than Dalston Parish. Referring to land to the north of Dalston Parish would imply land outside of the parish boundary, which would be beyond the DNP's remit.</p> <p><b>5.</b> Criteria d. should delete reference to 'existing' building. Focus instead on redundant buildings, as this avoids the situation where any current barn or building would be suitable for a housing conversion in the open countryside, which may be contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p><b>6.</b> The policy should provide clear direction. Rather than the use of 'note' there should be a new criteria for "proposals for the delivery of essential infrastructure...". It is recommended that the Steering Group also considers including reference here to allowing other appropriate rural development outside of the DDB (such as agricultural development etc)... Ultimately it should be clear that the DDB is focused on housing development. This should also be clarified in the justification (2nd paragraph).</p> <p><b>7.</b> Delivering Development Principles diagram – suggest including NPPF alongside the Local Plan on the green circle.</p>	<p><b>4. Acknowledged and amended.</b></p> <p><b>5. Acknowledged and amended.</b></p> <p><b>6. Acknowledged and amended.</b> For clarity and to reinforce the strategic principle of the DDB "new residential development is specifically mentioned. It is not considered necessary to mention "appropriate rural development outside the DDB..." as this is dealt with in Policy DNP-H 1.</p> <p><b>7. Acknowledged and amended.</b></p>
Housing Policies	Each of the policies is considered in turn. An initial observation at the outset however would be a suggested change of image used to illustrate the chapter – Rose Castle may be more appropriate for the heritage policies rather than the housing policy section, as it could be misleading to suggest this is typical of housing stock within the Parish.	<b>Acknowledged. Amended.</b>
Policy H1	The Council welcomes and supports the inclusion of reference to the potential need to include Dalston in future, district wide, searches should an anticipated shortfall in the five year housing land supply be reported. This is an important point that maintains conformity with the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.	<b>Noted.</b>
Policy H2	The Council supports how Policy H2 seeks to add to the policies in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.	<b>Noted.</b>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Policy H3	<p>There are some significant concerns about how effective this policy will be as currently drafted. Detailed comments include:</p> <p><b>1. Justification.</b> On rural schemes a calendar month (4 weeks) would be fairly typical for local connection to parishes on low cost home ownership properties, but on more recent Section 106 agreements the City Council have agreed to a shorter ‘cascade’ on Housing Association properties to minimise void rental loss. It is advisable that the DNP steering group seek the views of Housing Associations on this policy and whether they accept this approach, which differs from the City Council’s current method. We would be happy to assist with this engagement.</p> <p><b>2. Justification</b> – It is recommended that the bullet points be numbered to aid with clarity.</p> <p><b>3. Justification</b> - Bullet Point 1: It is considered sufficient to stipulate that someone was born in the relevant area. Insisting that their parents were “permanently resident” in the Neighbourhood Plan Area at the time of the applicant’s birth appears overly onerous and potentially discriminatory. It may prove difficult for people to prove – especially if their parents are now deceased, or were/are now separated or divorced. It is suggested that this requirement should be deleted.</p> <p><b>4. Justification</b> - Bullet point 3: delete the word “lawfully”. This is not necessary and potentially discriminatory.</p> <p><b>5. Justification</b> - Bullet point 4: the requirement of 15 years of continuous residence is considered to be overly long. A local connection is considered to be evident if a person previously lived in the relevant area for a period of at least 5 years. For consistency it is recommended that any significant departure for this needs to be clearly justified.</p>	<p><b>1.</b> The Steering Group met with representatives from Riverside Housing, the largest housing association with property in Dalston Parish and they were agreeable to a 4 week or 1 calendar month waiting period before any property could be offered to people outside the Parish. Notice of the Pre-submission draft Plan Consultation was issued to other housing associations with smaller interests in Dalston Parish.</p> <p><b>2. Acknowledged.</b> Amended.</p> <p><b>3. Acknowledged.</b> Amended to "The applicant was born in the Parish."</p> <p><b>4. Acknowledged.</b> Amended. "Lawfully" removed.</p> <p><b>5. Acknowledged.</b> Amended to "5 years".</p>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Policy H3	<p><b>6. Justification</b> - Bullet point 7: The idea that the Parish Council would determine the notion that an applicant has some other form of strong connection with the community could be problematic. It appears too vague and could also open the Parish Council up to accusations of bias on one hand and discrimination on the other. It is suggested that this reference should be removed.</p> <p><b>7. Justification</b> - Bullet point 8: The reference to parents living in the area or “another close family member” (needs to be defined) requiring a “substantial” degree of support (also needs to be defined) is problematic. Is the intention that parents would also need to have ‘substantial’ support needs – or do they just need to be resident in the plan area? This isn’t clear – if the parents just need to be resident this needs a separate bullet-point. There is concern however that this could then mean that someone may not have a local connection if their parents would have otherwise met the necessary criteria but are now deceased. This needs to be clarified. It would also be helpful to clarify what is meant by a family member, e.g. include “as defined by the Housing Act (1985) or any successor”. The use of the word “substantial” should be dropped to help make these requirements less subjective.</p> <p><b>8. Justification</b> - Bullet point 9: This seems to make it a lot easier for people over 55 to receive access to demonstrate a local connection, as there doesn’t seem to be a requirement for them to have a family member in need of support, or to be in need of support themselves? If this is the case then this would be highly discriminatory to people under the age of 55, and would do little to address, and indeed would likely exasperate, issues associated with an ageing population. This should be clarified. Would there be a need for someone over 55 to be in need of support from a local family member as a condition for a local connection?</p>	<p><b>6. Acknowledged.</b> Amended. “..or are determined by the Parish Council....”, has been removed.</p> <p><b>7. Acknowledged.</b> For clarity amended and reference to the Housing Act (1985) definition.</p> <p><b>8. Noted. For clarity amended to read</b> “... if over 55 and in need of support, they have a close family member currently living in the Parish”.</p>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Policy H3	Whilst it accepted that 76% of respondents to the DNP questionnaire expressed a desire for affordable housing to be 'solely' available to people with a strong local connection, it may be worth qualifying this by stating that people with an evidenced local connection will always receive an initial priority through the standard Section 106 Agreement procedures, but where a qualifying person cannot be identified within the required timescale the qualification criteria will be widened to include people with a local connection to Carlisle District.	<b>Noted.</b>
Policy H4	The intention to build on Local Plan policy is supported. Comments and suggestions for this policy include: <b>1.</b> Criteria 3 - Reference to a variation of densities as a requirement on new development is overly prescriptive and may not be achievable on smaller sites. Whilst it is understood where this concern arises from, to require it on all developments, where in some cases it may not be appropriate would not be workable in practice. An alternative wording would be to "provide appropriate densities". <b>2.</b> In criteria 5 there should be reference to having regard to appropriate height, as well as scale, massing and density. <b>3.</b> Justification second paragraph does not make sense – additional wording required.	<b>Noted.</b>  <b>1. Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.  <b>2. Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.  <b>3. Acknowledged.</b> Amended for clarity "...the character of the settlement within Dalston Parish, through...".
Jobs and Employment	Each of the policies are considered in turn. An initial observation at the outset however is that on pg. 19 it is not clear what is being referred to as the 'success of the southern link road development' at the top of the page. Especially as the southern link road is then referenced again in objective 4 below. Was this reference intended to be for the success of the Carlisle Northern Development Route opened in 2012?	<b>Acknowledged.</b> First reference amended, "..success of the "Carlisle Northern Development Route".



Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Policy JE 2	<p>The objective of this policy is supported. However, as drafted there are a number of significant concerns about how this policy will achieve those objectives. Detailed comments include:</p> <p><b>1.</b> Criteria 2 - The requirement for marketing of commercial properties for 24 months is considered to be too onerous. It could be interpreted as being contrary to the NPPF as it would provide an arbitrary block to other uses coming forward – is there any evidence to depart from the standard 12 month requirement currently used by Development Management? Please note Para 22 of the NPPF “Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose”.</p> <p><b>2.</b> The second part of the policy seems to confuse the requirements for on-site workers dwellings with those for general residential development proposals on unviable economic land. It is recommended that these policy elements are two different issues and should be addressed as two separate policies to avoid confusion.</p> <p><b>3.</b> Criteria 3 and 4 need to be linked with an ‘and’, or should be combined into one single criterion.</p> <p><b>4.</b> It is recommended that an additional criterion is included to ensure that acceptable living standards are achievable for any future residents of an on-site workers dwelling.</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b></p> <p><b>1. Acknowledged.</b> Amended to "12 months" to align with the NPPF.</p> <p><b>2. Acknowledged.</b> For greater clarity a new policy has been added.</p> <p><b>3. Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.</p> <p><b>4. Noted.</b> Beyond the scope of this plan and dealt with in Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 2030 Policy HO 6.</p>
Policy JE 3	<p>This policy is generally supported; however there is one significant concern, as follows:</p> <p><b>1.</b> In the absence of evidence for a 25 year requirement this is considered to not be in conformity with the NPPF. We would suggest deleting criteria 1d) and the requirement for the building to have existed for 25 years in its current form, which is considered to be too onerous. Such assessments should be made on their own merits. This reference should also be deleted from the justification.</p> <p>A more minor recommendation follows on from this:</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b></p> <p><b>1. Acknowledged. Deleted as suggested.</b></p>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
Policy JE 3	2. It is recommended that Criteria 2d) be changed to read as follows: "Appropriate screening, inclusive of native trees, is proposed, unless suitable screening is already in place". Sometimes acceptable screening may simply be bunding, which would not require screening by trees. There also needs to be recognition that sometimes screening can be best achieved by planting trees at various distances from a building rather than immediately adjacent.	2. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.
Policy JE4	This policy is supported, however it is recommended that reference "to the community" be deleted from the end of the policy. This is unnecessary, and it is considered sufficient to just say "to make the proposals acceptable."	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended for greater clarity. "...to make proposals acceptable as evidenced by any transport statement or assessment".
Policy JE 5	This policy is seen as positive, and would likely help to support the rural economy, given that poor broadband can act as a barrier to business growth.	<b>Noted.</b>
Policy JE 6	The intention of this policy to provide protection, whilst also retaining vitality for Dalston Square is welcomed and supported. A number of minor comments include: 1. It is recommended that the first sentence be changed to refer to development "fronting" Dalston Square as opposed to development "within" the square. 2. Criteria 2 – should be clarified. Is it referring to detrimental impact upon living conditions, i.e. the residential amenity, or upon the fabric of the buildings themselves? Or both? 3. Has Dalston Square been defined on the Policies Map? This is an area based policy so it should be clear geographically what is considered to be part of the Square and what is not.	<b>Noted.</b>  1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.  2. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended for greater clarity.  3. <b>Acknowledged.</b> New map provided.
Protecting Our Environment Policy E1	This policy is supported, however it is suggested that a different image should be used to illustrate this policy. The picture should be more of a celebration of the landscapes that make the Parish special, and which would justify protection.	<b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended picture as suggested.

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
	<p>Policy E3 The intended objectives of this policy are to be commended. However, this policy as drafted doesn't really say much, and related to matters already well covered by the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030. It reads more like an objective rather than a planning policy and would be difficult for Development Management planners to implement. It is suggested that this policy be deleted.</p>	<p><b>Acknowledged.</b> It is considered by the Steering Group that due to the high levels of interest in renewable energy in the Parish, it is important to have a policy dedicated to these issues. It has been redrafted to have more clarity as a policy and reference to the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 2030, Policy CC3 has been added.</p>
	<p>Policy E5 The intention of this policy in seeking to add to Local Plan policy is supported and welcomed. The following comments are intended to strengthen this policy and the Local Green Space designation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The word 'proposed' should be deleted from the first sentence – the DNP is making these designations, it isn't necessary to refer to them as proposed designations.</li> <li>2. It is recommended that the word 'inappropriate' be included in final part of the policy that mentions protection from (inappropriate) development. This policy should be extended to include detailed reference to how development proposals on an LGS would be considered – including, for example, proposals that would be compatible with and possibly enhance the green space. Alternatively it could highlight exceptions to the general presumption against development on an LGS. Any policy extension should be consistent with the NPPF.</li> <li>3. Finalised LGS numbers should perhaps follow a more numerically ordered system to aid with clarity.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Noted.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.</li> <li>2. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested and this policy has been extended to support compatible development that would enhance the LGS in line with the NPPF.</li> <li>3. <b>Acknowledged.</b> Amended for greater clarity.</li> </ol>

Policy	Comments / Recommendations	Action
General Comments	<p><b>1.</b> The policy references need to be different to the referencing used in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030, which, for example, also has a policy SP 1. This could lead to confusion, particularly when planning officers are composing reports that draw upon policies from both the DNP and from the Local Plan. Suggest DNP prefix on policies references.</p> <p><b>2.</b> Back cover – it is not understood what is meant by “The Dalston Neighbourhood Plan does not contain to policies that relate to excluded development”. What does this statement mean? Is it necessary?</p> <p><b>3.</b> We would seek to reaffirm that the Plan needs to be positively prepared in its entirety, looking to the future as to what it wants Dalston to be and how it wants the Parish to grow over the next 15 years. We are pleased to note that generally this is the case, although it is important to ensure that references to, or complaints about, past or unpopular development be avoided.</p>	<p><b>1. Acknowledged.</b> Amended as suggested.</p> <p><b>2. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>3. Noted.</b></p>