

Dear Mr Clarke

I am writing regarding the anomalies arising from the Denstone Neighbourhood Plan. Firstly, I would like to point out that at no time have the DNP Steering Group made any contact with myself either in the 2017 or 2023 reviews regarding consultations with the landowners. This would indicate a failure to follow due process as laid down and could be construed as an obvious bias in favour of others and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan must not proceed to referendum because this has led to a total lack of consultation throughout with landowners or questionnaires to the parishioners.

Regarding the Vinewood Farm site - on closer examination of the plan it would appear that the settlement boundary that usually runs along the outer build line has been deliberately removed adjacent to the site and now encompasses the whole field as shown. Furthermore, the realignment of the original settlement boundary would obviously imply that some corroboration or consultation had already taken place prior to the NHP review. This would appear to circumvent section 2.5 of their own plan and indicate that an allocation has already been made, thereby giving unfair and prior advantage to the landowner/developer over the other more suitable and sustainable sites nearer the village centre and the school. These have been deliberately ignored on the grounds they are outside the settlement boundary, yet it would appear the settlement boundary has already been altered at Vinewood Farm to include the total density of the allocation for Denstone for the next ten years (2023-2033). This location is against the ethos of the Neighbourhood Plan and as far from the village hub as it is possible to get being set on the outer limits of the village. The QB would have us believe other sites are not strategic allocations but at least two other sites in the village are far more suitable and sustainable, nearer and with greater accessibility to all village amenities including public transport. It can never be a cohesive or inclusive part of the community due largely to its remoteness, steep access and also its lack of a safe footway to the village and that could well encroach onto Ollivers Green LGSB, which they themselves identify as an important heritage site. Clearly, the QB are totally dependant on the inflexibility of the settlement boundary when it comes to eliminating entirely the other more sustainable sites within the village and leaving no option other than their own choice as a fait accompli to the community.

In the light of all the above, this plan should NOT go to referendum because it leaves the village without any choice regarding any future development. A true and unbiased appraisal must be made of the more sustainable sites available, preferably by an independent body and NOT by persons whose own situation within the village environs could adversely influence such important and far reaching decisions for the future of the village.

Yours faithfully,

Robert (&Pauline) Johnson