

Representation Reference	Consultee / Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally compliant?	Sound? (Inclusive of positively prepared, justified effective and consistent with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes?	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comments
1	Environment Agency (Joe Drewry)	Whole Document	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	(Summary) Local Green Spaces could offer the opportunity to include natural flood management as part of its design.
2	Charles Cuddington	Whole Document	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	No	No comments to make
3	Cllr Trevor Southerd	Whole Document	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	No	requesting George St. Church Griesley be included as a new site
4	Repton Parish Council (Ewan Thompson)	Site 155	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Whole document but particular scrutiny has been given to Page 15 and maps 11a and 11b as that section relates to Milton and Repton. This response is made recognising the statements made in sustainability appraisal main report paragraph 7.9 and the consultation statement page 6 and 7. It is noted that there is good alignment with the emerging Repton Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan, with the exception of the Orchard, Milton, Site 155. As explained to SDDC, the NDP will not be altered unless required by the examiner.
5	Linton Parish Council (Clare Orme)	Site 168	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	No	(Summary) I have been asked to inform you by Linton Parish Council that the Linton Orchard on Colliery Lane and the Linton Recreation Ground on Main Street Linton are owned and managed by Linton Parish Council. Linton Parish Council are happy for these sites to be part of the consultation as this will protect the parcels of land further. Linton Parish Council have no objections to the LGS consultation.
6	Pegasus (Jonathan Protheroe)	Site 93	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	Yes	No	(Summary) Do not consider that the site is demonstrably special to the local community in line with the NPPF. Evidence that the site (specifically land north of the footpath) is demonstrably special has not been provided by the Council. Consider the site is a relatively featureless paddock with no beneficial significance due to its beauty.
7	Pegasus (Jonathan Protheroe)	Site 93	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	Yes	No	(Summary) The site should not have been carried forward to the Stage 2 Assessment as it is privately owned land (a private paddock without public access). It is not considered appropriate for designation as it is not valued community space. The site benefits from protection through existing Conservation Area policy.
8	Hartshorne Village Residents Association (A.J. Gosden)	Whole Document	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	As a residents association we do not feel qualified to formally comment on the "Test of Soundness". We do however consider that the Council's Planning Policy Team have been meticulous in the preparation of the Local Green Spaces Plan and at every stage have listened to and noted our suggestions and comments and been fully inclusive of the local community. They are to be commended in producing such an in-depth document which has investigated and assessed every aspect of all the suggested sites in compiling the final version of the Local Green Spaces Plan.	No	No	We have studied in depth the Council's proposals for Local Green Spaces in Hartshorne and are completely satisfied that they have been assessed fully and that they are included in the proposed submission to the Secretary of State. We have also noted the reasons for excluding other sites in the village that we originally proposed and fully understand and agree with those decisions.
9	Fisher German (Scott O'Dell)	Site 84	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	Yes	(Summary) It is considered that there is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the area is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance. Consider that the use class is D1, and that the public support for vegetable growing is an unauthorised activity (adjacent to the site). Consider the Melbourne festival is just one weekend in September and therefore not significant. The site falls within the Conservation Area and therefore already benefits from protection. A LGS designation would limit the ability of the community facility from evolving in the future.
10	Highways England (Steve Freek)	Whole Document	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	No	(Summary) As the document relates to issues outside the remit of Highways England and will not affect the operation of the SPN, we do not have any specific comments to provide.
11	Severn Trent Water (Jack Robinson)	Whole Document	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	(Left blank)	No	No	(Summary) Strongly supportive of the concept of local green spaces for amenity and biodiversity as well as flood mitigation.
12	Paul Cullen	Whole Document	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	(BDDC Note - no comment made by consultee)
13	Gladman (John Fleming)	Whole Document	No	No	No	No	Yes	(Summary) Consider that the LGS methodology could allow for sites to come forward that are considered an extensive tract of land and therefore not in accordance with National Policy.
14	Planning Prospects (Rachel Hall)	Whole Document	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Planning Prospects supports the approach taken to identifying and assessing sites suitable for designation as Local Green Spaces, and the proposed policies to support the appropriate development and management of these sites.