

Appendix 6

Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation Responses

(19 September–31 October 2018)

A. National and Statutory Bodies

Sport England email 25 September 2018
The Coal Authority letter 30 October 2018
Environment Agency letter 20 October 2018
Highways England letter 23 October 2018
Historic England letter 23 October 2018
National Grid letter 19 September 2018
Network Rail email 13 September 2018

B. Local Authorities and Parish Councils

Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council letter 31 October 2018
Maer and Aston Parish Council letter 24 September 2018
Loggerheads Parish Council email 17 October 2018

C. Residents' responses

Resident 01 – email 17 October 2018
Resident 02 – email 28 October 2018
Residents 03 – letter 25 October 2018
(See also Appendix 5 for residents' responses submitted via response form)

A. National and Statutory Bodies

Sport England email 25 September 2018

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document. http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the</p>	<p>General comments noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

<p>neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</p> <p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England’s Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England’s planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p>		
---	--	--

The Coal Authority Letter 30 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield.</p> <p>According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are risks from past coal mining activity in the form of likely historic unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth.</p>	<p>General comments noted.</p> <p>Section 1.5.4 Coal and Gas, make a new section, including the Coal Authority comments</p>	<p>Add comments re current defined coalfield.</p> <p>Made 3 subsections for coal, gas and electricity; added further info from Coal Authority.</p>

<p>Consideration will need to be given to the potential risks posed by coal mining legacy if sites are allocated for future development.</p> <p>In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) please continue to consult The Coal Authority on planning matters using the specific email address of planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk.</p> <p>The Coal Authority wishes the Neighbourhood Plan team every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
--	--	--

Environment Agency Letter 20 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>FLOOD RISK</p> <p>We have reviewed the draft plan with regard to main river flood risk and in our strategic overview role and have the following comments. There are no main rivers within the plan area. The Meece Brook (main river downstream of plan area) drains the southern and eastern part of the plan area.</p> <p>There are a number of ordinary watercourses, some of which have areas of floodplain associated with them. Some of the ordinary watercourses are also culverted in places. There are also areas at risk of surface water flooding across the plan area. Staffordshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted on these matters.</p> <p>Due to its location in the headwaters of a number of catchments, all proposals for new development must demonstrate that any existing flood risk will not be increased elsewhere (downstream), ideally by managing surface water on site and limiting runoff to the greenfield rate or better. The use of sustainable drainage systems and permeable surfaces will be encouraged where appropriate. Consideration should also be given to the impact of new development on both existing and future flood risk. Where appropriate, development should include measures that mitigate and adapt to climate change.</p> <p>In line with National Planning Policy we would wish to see all new development</p>	<p>Comments on Flood Risk, setting out NPPF requirements. Comments noted.</p> <p>Suggestion on long-term maintenance of SUDS is dealt with in the interpretation of policy NE2.</p> <p><i>Bullet Point Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A clear statement that, in line with national policy, all new development should be directed away from those areas at highest flood risk, i.e. towards Flood Zone 1.</i> Check that rationale reflects national policy. • <i>A clarification that new</i> 	

<p>sequentially tested, directed away from those areas at highest flood risk, i.e. towards Flood Zone 1. In addition all new development, including infill development and small scale development, should incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to reduce flood risk and manage surface water and to ensure that runoff does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Planning applications for development within the Neighbourhood Plan area must be accompanied by site-specific flood risk assessments in line with the requirements of National Planning Policy and associated guidance. These should take account of the latest climate change allowances. We have the following recommendations in relation to the proposed policies within the Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p>Policy NE1: Natural Environment Recommend that include watercourses and their floodplains in the first bullet point.</p> <p>Policy NE2: Sustainable Drainage The requirement for incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) is to reduce flood risk and manage surface water and to ensure that runoff does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, taking into account the likely impacts of climate change. We therefore support inclusion of this policy which could be strengthened by adding a requirement to take into account the impacts of climate change and a requirement for all SuDS to be maintained so that they operate effectively, for example:</p> <p><i>Long term maintenance arrangements for all SuDS should also be in place for the lifetime of the development and agreed with the relevant risk management authority.</i></p> <p>The sustainable drainage evidence section refers to Map 16, Environment Agency Flood Zones. It should be noted that these flood zones only relate to fluvial flood risk and not surface water flood risk. Some of the supporting text regarding flood risk and culverts would be better covered by including as policy statements either in policy NE1 or expanding NE2 to cover wider flood risk issues as well as sustainable drainage. For example:</p>	<p><i>development proposals must also demonstrate that they will not increase flood risk elsewhere both in and out of the parish.</i></p> <p>Amend Policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposals for new development should consider future flood risk and, where appropriate, include measures that mitigate and adapt to the anticipated impacts of climate change.</i> This is vague and NPPF already deals with this. No Change. • <i>Existing open watercourses should not be culverted. Where feasible, opportunities to open up culverted watercourses should be sought to reduce the associated flood risk and danger of collapse whilst taking advantage of opportunities to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure.</i> No change this is in the interpretation of policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy NE1: Make modification suggested. Completed • Policy NE2: No change. • Add relevant flood risk information from letter into evidence section. Completed. • Make clear in Map 16 this is relating to fluvial and not surface water. Completed • Add a sentence to the end of policy “This includes consideration of whether new development will increase flood risk elsewhere (in and out of the neighbourhood area)”. Completed • Add the following into the
--	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear statement that, in line with national policy, all new development should be directed away from those areas at highest flood risk, i.e. towards Flood Zone 1. • A clarification that new development proposals must also demonstrate that they will not increase flood risk elsewhere both in and out of the parish. • Proposals for new development should consider future flood risk and, where appropriate, include measures that mitigate and adapt to the anticipated impacts of climate change. • Existing open watercourses should not be culverted. Where feasible, opportunities to open up culverted watercourses should be sought to reduce the associated flood risk and danger of collapse whilst taking advantage of opportunities to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure. • Retention and creation of local green spaces and green infrastructure can provide a role with managing and mitigating flood risk as well as enhancing biodiversity and providing connectivity. • Implementation of natural flood management measures will be encouraged and promoted to contribute towards delivering a reduction in local and catchment- wide flood risk and the impacts of climate change as well as achieve other wider environmental benefits. <p>Policy COM2: Local Green Space Local green spaces can play a significant role in managing flood risk and flood mitigation in the area, particularly in relation to surface water flooding. Consideration should be given to including this in the policy statement and interpretation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retention and creation of local green spaces and green infrastructure can provide a role with managing and mitigating flood risk as well as enhancing biodiversity and providing connectivity.</i> Comments noted, add this exact wording into the interpretation. • <i>Implementation of natural flood management measures will be encouraged and promoted to contribute towards delivering a reduction in local and catchment-wide flood risk and the impacts of climate change as well as achieve other wider environmental benefits.</i> Comments noted, add this exact wording into the interpretation. <p>Policy COM2: <i>Local Green Space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Local green spaces can play a significant role in managing flood risk and flood mitigation in the area, particularly in relation to surface water flooding.</i> 	<p>interpretation for Policy: <i>Implementation of natural flood management measures will be encouraged and promoted to contribute towards delivering a reduction in local and catchment-wide flood risk and the impacts of climate change as well as to achieve other wider environmental benefits. Retention and creation of local green spaces and green infrastructure can provide a role with managing and mitigating flood risk as well as enhancing biodiversity and providing connectivity.</i></p> <p>Completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy COM2: Consider putting this into the rationale: <i>Local green spaces can play a significant role in managing flood risk and flood mitigation in the area, particularly in relation to surface water</i>
--	--	---

<p>Policy HG1: New Housing This policy could be strengthened by adding the following to the list of development requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be directed away from those areas at highest flood risk, i.e. towards Flood Zone 1. • Demonstrate that it will not increase flood risk elsewhere, both in and out of the parish. • Consider future flood risk and, where appropriate, include measures that mitigate and adapt to the anticipated impacts of climate change. <p>BIODIVERSITY The Environment Agency is generally in support of the policies / proposals outlined in the Plan regarding biodiversity along with the protection of local green spaces and nature conservation sites. The Neighbourhood Plan mentions the importance of watercourses as wildlife corridors and how culverts should be removed wherever possible. We recommend in Policy NE2 for Sustainable Drainage including a comment on how SUDs should aim to reduce urban runoff pollution entering watercourses.</p> <p>GROUNDWATER & CONTAMINATION We have the following comments to make which relate solely to the protection of ‘Controlled Waters’ receptors. We do not consider that the plan is likely to have significant impacts on ‘Controlled Waters’ receptors. In planning any development in this area reference should be made to our ‘Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice’ (GP3) document. This sets out our position on a wide range of activities and</p>	<p><i>Consideration should be given to including this in the policy statement and interpretation. Consider putting this into the rationale.</i></p> <p>Policy HG1, comments noted, don’t add the text here, instead cross-reference to Policy NE2.</p> <p>Comments noted on biodiversity, add to interpretation of NE2 the suggested recommendation on surface-run off.</p> <p>Comments noted on the ground water contamination. Cross reference to their document and source protection zones in the evidence base section.</p>	<p><i>flooding.</i> Completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy HG1: comments noted, don’t add the text here, instead cross-reference to Policy NE2. Completed • Add to interpretation of NE2 the suggested recommendation on surface-run off. Completed • Cross reference to their various documents and zones in the evidence base section (paraphrase them). Completed • Add to NE2. EA also reference groundwater source protection zones – our map 15 shows these. References to groundwater and aquifer maps added
---	--	---

<p>developments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storage of pollutants and hazardous substances • Solid waste management • Discharge of liquid effluents into the ground (including site drainage) • Management of groundwater resources • Land contamination • Ground source heat pumps • Cemetery developments Parts of the area are located within Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3. Source Protection Zones are designated to protect the quality of groundwater abstractions used for drinking water purposes. Within Source Protection Zones certain activities may be restricted, for example underground storage of hazardous substances (e.g. petrol or diesel) in Zone 1. Government Policy, as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 120), states that <i>‘where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner’</i>. Consequently should a development site currently or formerly have been subject to land-use(s) which have the potential to have caused contamination of the underlying soils and groundwater then any Planning Application must be supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment. This should demonstrate that the risks posed to ‘Controlled Waters’ by any contamination are understood by the applicant and can be safely managed. <p>We recommend that the risk management framework provided in the document ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination’ (CLR11) is followed, when dealing with land affected by contamination. According to information held by the Environment Agency there are several historic landfill sites within the neighbourhood plan area. We recommend that the local council, as lead regulator for these sites, are contacted for further information. The potential to mobilise any existing contamination during the proposed development of these sites should be considered. If you have any queries please contact me on the details below.</p>		
---	--	--

Highways England Letter 23 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. With reference to the Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer, Aston and Whitmore area, the closest strategic road is the M6 motorway. This represents the Northeast boundary of the plan area.</p> <p>This consultation seeks comment on Draft 1.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan dated September 2018. As you will be aware, Highways England previously commented on Draft 1.0 of the plan dated March 2018.</p> <p>We have reviewed the latest version of the plan, and Highways England has further no substantive comments to make.</p>	Comments Noted.	No Action Required.

Historic England Letter 23 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>In general our earlier Regulation 14 comments, therefore, remain entirely relevant. That is:</p> <p><i>“Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it. We are very pleased to note that the quite exhaustive Plan evidence base is (inter alia) well informed by reference to the</i></p>	Comments Noted.	No Action Required.

<p><i>Staffordshire Historic Environment Record and includes historic landscape analysis.</i></p> <p><i>The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness through good design and the protection of heritage assets, local green space and important views, along with landscape character is to be applauded We also commend the approach to sustainable design in Policy DC2 and the production of a Design Statement for Baldwins Gate at 6.7 (now 2.8)".</i></p> <p>In conclusion, the plan reads overall as a well written, well-considered and fit for purpose document. We consider that an exemplary approach is taken to the historic environment of the Parish and that the Plan constitutes a very good example of community led planning.</p>		
---	--	--

National Grid Letter 19 September 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid</p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport</p>	<p>Comments noted. Check amendment made from previous consultation: Include in the strategic context section a short paragraph on the gas pipeline.</p> <p>Section 1.5.4 Coal and Gas, make a new section, and add the text from the letter making reference to the gas network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check amendments made. Made 3 subsections for coal, gas and electricity; added further info from National Grid

gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

Assets in your area

National Grid has identified the following high-pressure gas transmission pipelines as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:

FM04 Alrewas to Audley

FM21 Audley to Alrewas From the consultation information provided, the above gas transmission pipeline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites. *Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure* Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@cadentgas.com

Electricity distribution

Information regarding the distribution network can be found at:
www.energynetworks.org.uk

<p>Key resources / contacts</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p>		
---	--	--

Network Rail email 13 September 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>As you are aware Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order); in addition you are required to consult the Office of Rail and Road (ORR).</p> <p>(1) Developments in the neighbourhood development area should be notified to Network Rail to ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area. b. That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage works / water features (no soakaways within 30m of the railway boundary, all water to drain in the direction away from the railway) 	<p>Comments Noted. Add into the text on rail that Network Rail have asked to be notified on relevant planning applications.</p>	<p>Add contact details to WCML section in Strategic Context chapter. Details added</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attenuation ponds should not form part of proposals• Encroachment of land or air-space• Excavation works• Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues• Lighting impacting upon train drivers ability to perceive signals• Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments• Any piling works• Any scaffolding works• Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949)• Any use of crane or plant• Any demolition works• Any hard standing areas• Fencing for proposals adjacent to the railway should be a minimum of 1.8m high, steel palisade trespass proof and set back 1m from the railway boundary• Induced voltages from the 25kv OHL may impact proposals		
--	--	--

B. Local Authorities and Parish Councils

Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council letter 31 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>See Appendix 6a, letter dated October 2018 [received 31 October 2018]</p>	<p>Page 1: Comments noted no change.</p> <p>Page 2: Comments noted no change.</p> <p>Page 3: Comments noted, check NPPF quotes, revise policy matrix to reflect order of document, add list of policies to table of context, check HS2 evidence is proportionate, consider the size of document and remove any non-essential information. Remove repetition, for example where the Local Plan occurs twice. Consider simplifying the structure to ensure the NP is a usable document, with clear contents and remove any non-essential information (making a separate background document, will help the make the plan effect and fit for purpose in practice).</p> <p>Contents and Layout: Comments noted, see comments above on structure and layout.</p> <p>Policy NE1: No amendment as this weakens the policy.</p> <p>Policy NE2: Comments Noted, suggested a telephone conversation with NULBC to discuss amendments to interpretation and how to incorporate their comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all NPPF quotes have been updated to 2018 version. All quotes revised previously to 2018. • Move policy matrix to reflect order of document. Completed • Add list of policies to table of contents. Completed • Ensure that the HS2 text is proportionate. Yes, it is part of the evidence base • Remove all of sections 1.7, 1.8. 1.9. 1.10; write a brief section 1.7 stating: CSS and saved polices in force until JLP adopted in 2021; NDP has had regard for vision and aims of the JLP and each policy references CSS and Saved policies and JLP aims that it conforms with Completed • Consider the evidence included and remove any non-essential information. Reorganised evidence chapters into separate volume • Consider simplifying the structure, see comments. Document divided into 2 volumes: Policies; Supporting evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE2 discuss with NULBC re amendments to interpretation and how to incorporate their comments. Amendments reviewed in meeting with NULBC

	<p>Policy COM1: Comments Noted. Suggest amending the interpretation to address comment.</p> <p>Section 2.2: Comments noted amended 2.2.2 to make clear the designations are being made. Comments noted on LGS, ensure that the LGS designations are appropriate.</p> <p>Policy COM3: Comments noted, amend the policy to reflect the comments.</p> <p>Policy DC1: Comments noted, check terminology and amend</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy COM1: Suggested amended first para of Interpretation: <i>“This is an enabling policy for new community facilities in sustainable and/or accessible locations and further development of existing community facilities. Sustainable and/or accessible locations for shops and other facilities that would serve the local community would be within the existing centers where there is concentration of housing. Sustainable locations for facilities involving use of open land would depend to a significant degree on landscape sensitivity and other landscape impacts. This will help to ensure that the area is supported by a range of community facilities.”</i> Completed • Amend para 2.2.2 to read “The following spaces are designated by the Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston and Whitmore Neighbourhood Plan as Local Green Space” Completed. • For LGS they have said do not meet the NPPF criteria, either define the community value more robustly or other criteria or remove where this cannot be demonstrated. Revised LGS introductory section; descriptions checked for robustness. • Policy COM3: Amend the policy text to replace first sentence to read: <i>“In considering use of financial contributions for community and other infrastructure ...”</i> Completed • Remove ref to S106 and CIL and add reference to S106 and any future CIL to interpretation. Completed • Policy DC1 Check terminology to be consistent with LPA
--	---	--

	<p>to reflect comments. Cross reference to the Local List to make clear in the interpretation that these are also included. Update interpretation to include suggested additional text on conversion. No amendment to include a glossary, ensure that terms are commonly used for consistency.</p> <p>Policy DC2: Make sure the interpretation on high quality durable materials is compatible with policy DC1.</p> <p>Policy DC3 & DC4: Policies cannot be created for land covered under the Highways Act. Remove point 7 of Policy DC3 and integrate into wording of policy DC4. Ensure consistent wording 'New development' throughout policies.</p> <p>Policy DC5: Comments noted make amendments to remove 'signage'.</p>	<p>suggestions throughout.</p> <p>Completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross reference to the Local List to make clear in the interpretation that these are also included. Completed • Interpretation: add sentence to read: <i>"In considering impacts of building conversions it is necessary to include consideration of associated works such as new/improved access/driveway, parking areas, gardens, boundary treatments, lighting and outbuildings."</i> Completed Also mentioned Para 146 in NPPF re-use of buildings in the Green Belt. Para. 146d is already listed in the x-refs to NPPF. • Policy DC2: Make sure the interpretation on high quality durable materials is compatible with policy DC1. Completed • Policy DC3: Remove point 7 and integrate into wording of policy DC4. Completed • Policy DC4: Amend Policy to read: <i>"New development must take opportunities to improve connections to and enhance existing footpath, cycle route and bridleway networks."</i> Completed • Policy DC4: Ensure text is consistent to read 'New Development' Ensure consistent wording throughout policies. Completed; 'new development' throughout policies • Policy DC5: Amend wording to remove 'signage' and add in 'that form part of new development'. Completed
--	---	---

	<p>Policy DC7: Retro-fit in most circumstances would not require P.P. Other comments can be addressed through amending the policy.</p> <p>Policy EB1: Comments noted, clarify point with NULBC as they suggested 'Connectivity Statement' addition to the interpretation.</p> <p>Policy EB2: Comments noted, amend second sentence in policy to read "Such impacts may include consideration of....."</p> <p>Housing Growth: Comments noted, all the policies in housing and design are applicable to the neighbourhood area. Policy DC2 addresses the points raised, clarify that this covers the point raised.</p> <p>Policy HG1: Comments noted. Provide clarity on sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>Policy HG2: Comments noted. No change</p> <p>Policy HG3: Comments noted, consider amending the policy to identify and list the needs in policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DC7: Reword to read: <i>"The installation of renewable energy technologies as part of new housing or commercial developments will be welcomed, providing they would have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or on the rural environment. This includes consideration of noise, disturbance, traffic movement, visual impacts, dust, vibrations and other impacts."</i> Completed • Policy EB1: Clarify point with NULBC. Amendments reviewed in meeting with NULBC • Policy EB2: amend second sentence in policy to read "Such impacts may include consideration of....." Completed • Housing Growth: Policy DC2 addresses the points raised, clarify that this covers the point raised. Reviewed in meeting with NULBC • Policy HG1: Add in to the interpretation a sentence that lists the sensitive landscapes or other areas recognized by the NP itself. Done; inserted references to relevant maps • Policy HG3: Consider amending the policy to identify and list the needs in policy. This could be done with NULBC to agree a form of wording.
--	---	--

Maer and Aston Parish Council letter 24 September 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p><u>Neighbourhood Development Plan</u></p> <p>Maer & Aston Parish Council met last night to discuss the amendments to the CMAW Neighbourhood Development Plan and I attach a copy of our minutes for your information.</p> <p>You will note that two areas were highlighted; Policy</p> <p>Policy EB1 – Councillors felt that although developers were encouraged to provide high speed internet/communications, it was essential that wording would include ‘fibre to the premises’.</p> <p>Policy HG3 – Councillors had learnt that Newcastle Borough Council’s Open Spaces Strategy had not been updated which may cause problems for the NDP. Wording should be amended to include that any contribution to leisure facilities should be made specific to the area. Also that amenity spaces should be sited ‘carefully’.</p> <p>Overall Councillors were impressed with the comments from the consultation and the amendments made to reflect the changes needed. Maer & Aston Parish Council are happy for the Steering to progress to the next stage. Councillors expressed thanks to the Steering Group for the level of work put in to this project.</p>	<p>Comments noted, Policy EB1 make amendment after checking the wording in latest NPPF. Policy HG3, meaning unclear ‘made specific to the area’. QB to talk to PC to clarify meaning and any amendment required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy EB1 make amendment after checking the wording in latest NPPF. See action on NULBC comments above • Policy HG3, discuss comment with PC and reflect the comments in policy or interpretation as appropriate. The comment relates to an earlier version of the policy that was replaced with the current policy.

Loggerheads Parish Council email 17 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
Loggerheads Parish Council support the policies in the draft Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan as they complement and support those in the Loggerheads Neighbourhood Plan. The team involved are to be congratulated on all their hard work as the evidence base is strong.	Comments noted supporting the plan.	No Change.

C. Residents' responses

Resident 01 – email 17 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
Section 7.1.1 refers to parish councils as statutory consultees in planning applications. Parish councils are NOT statutory consultees – word “statutory” should be removed.	Comment noted. Make amendment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the amendment. <p>Completed</p>

Resident 02 – email 28 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>In response to the Regulation 14 consultation on the Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston and Whitmore Neighbourhood Plan, draft 1.1, the following additions to the Policies chapter and Appendix 1 are suggested.</p> <p>COM2 Local Green Space Add to the list of examples in the Interpretation: Examples would be a small storage and changing facility to support a sports or recreational use, an open-air shelter to support use for community events, or fixed play and/or outdoor gym equipment.</p> <p>DC5 Impact of lighting In a consultation response to planning application 18/00491/FUL at Blackbrook in the NA the NuLBC Environmental Health Department refers to the Institute of Lighting Professionals' Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011. Therefore add the following to the Interpretation: Applicants are recommended to refer to the Institute of Lighting Professionals, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011, https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light/. Also add this document to the References and evidence base.</p>	Comments noted. Make the amendments as suggested except for that to appendix 1. Putting reference to planning applications is considered out of date. On housing land supply, LPA has restated 5.89 years reported in Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2018–2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the amendments listed in the response except appendix 1. <p>Completed</p>

<p>HG1 Housing Growth</p> <p>The Planning Department of NuLBC reported to the Planning Committee on 27 September 2018 that under the Government formula for calculating housing need, as of 20 September 2018 the LPA has a housing land supply of 5.45 years. Therefore add the following to the Evidence, immediately before the heading ‘Housing applications and completions’:</p> <p><i>Housing land supply</i></p> <p>The NuLBC Planning Department reported to the 27 September 2018 meeting of the Planning Committee that the LPA has a housing land supply of 5.45 years. For details see the following 2 reports: Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2018–2023, https://moderngov.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/documents/s27140/2017-18%205%20Year%20Land%20Supply%20Statement%20final%20v3.13.pdf; Supplementary information, https://moderngov.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/documents/s27256/5YHLSS%20GRB.pdf.</p> <p>Also add these 2 reports to the References and evidence base.</p> <p>Appendix 1, LGSW19, Green Gap, Fair Green Road–Moss Cottages</p> <p>Under heading ‘Planning permissions’ note: Application 16/01101/FUL refused, appeal withdrawn; 17/01024/FUL refused, no appeal lodged within time limit.</p> <p>Under heading ‘Description’ add: At its 25 January 2018 meeting the Grading Committee of Staffordshire Wildlife Trust extended the boundary of Chorlton Moss LWS (73/99/98) to include part (c. 45%) of this field. Add reference to the site report and boundary map to the References and evidence base.</p>		
---	--	--

Residents 03 – letter 25 October 2018

Representations and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
--	----------	------------------------------------

<p>Summary of Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Plan is too lengthy • 2 Ad hoc personal views included • 3 Vision and aims and range of homes and locations • 4 Sports Facilities • 5 Renewable energy • 6 Visitor Centre • 7 Page 322 LGS designations • 8 Pg 54 Rompers Row • 9 Public Footpaths • 10 Green Space • 11 Community Facilities • 12 Chorlton Moss 	<p>Summary of points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point 1, generalized comments without raising specific areas of the NP to be modified. • Bullet Point 2, generalized comments unclear on modification being suggested. No change. • Bullet Point 3, generalized comments, Policy HG1 identifies sustainable locations. No change. • Bullet Point 4, sports facilities are need to accommodate people with a range of mobility. Policy draws on evidence not just a popularity vote. The need to reduce journey's has also been considered. No Change. • Bullet Point 5, Unclear what large scale development is being referred to. No change. • Bullet Point 6, Unclear from comment what is being reflected. Action just check about references to a visitor centre. • Bullet Point 7, Comments on the LGS. Concerns about the validity of making LGS designations on verges. Action, consider if the LGS will be affective for verges in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point 1: Review the plan and consider moving more detailed evidence and plans to a background document. See action on NuLBC comments re document structure • Bullet Point 6: check about references to a visitor centre. Non-policy chapter, 7.1.1. Visitor centre mentioned, but no location suggested. • Bullet point 7: consider if the LGS will be effective for verges in the Highway. See action on NuLBC comments re LGS • Bullet Point 8: Check the correct name of road is used and amend if applicable. Completed • Bullet Point 12: Check the correct reference is made to the sewerage treatment works. It is Baldwins Gate Sewage Works on the STW notice at the gate, and the location is Chorlton Moss in Chapel and Hill Chorlton parish
---	---	--

	<p>the Highway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bullet Point 8, Check the correct name of road is used and amend if applicable.• Bullet Point 9, Comments noted, designation recognises wider community value of footpaths. No change.• Bullet Point 10, unclear of what modification is being suggested. No change.• Bullet Point 11, Comments noted, the policy is about enabling community facilities where providers see a need for them. No change.• Bullet Point 12, Comments noted on Chorlton Moss, check the correct reference is made to the sewerage treatment works.	
--	--	--