

## Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan

### Regulation 16 representations

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
R1	Dr John R Fawn, Rangemore	HE1 and HE2	First may I declare an interest in that I am chairman of the Community Group. I only have one major concern relating to the plan. It appears there is a paradox between policies HE1 and HE2. This revolves around the restrictions placed in HE1 "In all instances, applications for more than 6 dwellings in Rangemore village on any one site and 4 dwellings in Tatenhill village on any one site will not be permitted." The restriction of 4 dwellings on any one site in Tatenhill almost certainly precludes the building of any social housing in that village. The number should in my opinion be changed to 6 in Tatenhill to match the permitted building in Rangemore.	
R2	Steve Southern, Growth and Development, Severn Trent Water	whole document	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan. However, Severn Trent Water have no observations on the plan at this time. Should the emerging plan(s) for the Tatenhill area involve major housing developments, then STW would welcome early consultations on such proposals.	
R3	Maggie Taylor, Sport England	RT3	Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above document. I have been unable to download the representation form from the website as unfortunately the link does not appear to be operational. I have therefore captured Sport England's comment in this email, I hope that is acceptable. Sport England supports the development of Neighbourhood Plans, in particular because they offer an opportunity to protect and provide sports facilities of local importance. Sport England welcome reference to the importance of sports pitches to the	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>local community in Policy RT3. It is disappointing however that the Plan makes no reference to a detailed assessment of outdoor sport provision set out in the East Staffordshire Playing Pitch Strategy and the recently adopted Outdoor Sport Delivery and Investment Plan. This latter document shows that there is a shortfall of playing fields in the Burton area and recommends (as embedded in the draft Local Plan) a series of 5 sports hubs, one of which falls within the Neighbourhood Boundary but for which there is no recognition or provision. Sport England would therefore recommend the Neighbourhood Plan is amended to ensure it is compliant with the Local Plan and Outdoor Sport Investment and Delivery Plan in that it encourages the Sports Hub and includes it within Appendix 1 to increase the chances of securing investment to support its delivery. At this point in time the site already has planning permission for a rugby club site (relocated from the centre of Burton on Trent) and the proposal is to extend this site, in area and range of sports facilities, to help address the current deficit in outdoor sports provision as well as growing demand from developments such as Lawns Farm. If you need any further information do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
R4	Sarah Victor, Environment Agency	Whole document	<p>RE: TATENHILL NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROPOSAL. I refer to your email dated 9 June 2014 regarding the above Neighbourhood Development Plan. Having reviewed the document we have the following comments to make: We welcome the changes to this document submitted to your authority by Tatenhill Parish Council and community group which proposes a number of policies on housing, recreation, landscape and countryside. In particular we welcome objective 3: Biodiversity and Ecology, which seeks to 'preserve and</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>enhance the parish's biodiversity, through supporting the retention, creation and improvement of the blue and green infrastructure networks, including woodland, hedgerows and streams'. We welcome, in regards to Strategic Policy (SP) 1, that 'proposals will only be permitted where they are acceptable in terms of, where appropriate', (2.) the 'Preservation of trees, hedgerows, biodiversity and key landscape features', (3.) the 'Preservation or enhancement of the character of the Conservation Areas', and (5.) 'Flood Risk'. We also welcome Landscape and Countryside (LC) Policy 2. Which states that 'Protected green spaces, as marked on the NDP Proposals Map, will be protected from all development types in order to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the village townscape and to offer long term recreational opportunities' and that the 'NDP supports the protection and enhancement of Sites of Biological Interest throughout the parish'.</p>	
R5	East Staffordshire Borough Council	Whole document	<p>Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan – publicity consultation stage representation 10<sup>th</sup> July 2014.</p> <p>Firstly we would like to congratulate the community group and Parish Council on a fantastic job to get the Neighbourhood Plan to submission. This will be only the third plan to get to submission stage in East Staffordshire.</p> <p>The plan has been well-written and extensive consultation has been carried out on all aspects of the plan and policies. ESBC has a number of comments at this stage as the plan has altered so much since the draft consultation. It does not detract however, from all the hard work that has gone into the plan from the community, which should be applauded.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>The following comments are from colleagues in Planning Policy (including historic environment), Development Control and Housing Strategy and are designed to offer guidance on the policies in the plan and how they will be practically delivered once the plan is made by ESBC after a successful referendum and are to be considered by the independent examiner.</p> <p>SP1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list of criteria does not refer to the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties.</li> <li>• Criteria 5 could include Flood risk <b>and drainage</b></li> </ul> <p>SP2 – no comment</p> <p>SP3 – no comment</p> <p>SP4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any on-site renewable energy generation technology statement could be more detailed to say it will only be acceptable where it does not adversely affect the character and appearance of individual buildings or their surroundings.</li> <li>• First paragraph of policy ‘attempt to uphold the principles of development as set out in the NPPF’ – if it doesn’t meet the principles of sustainable development then it wouldn’t get permission anyway...</li> <li>• First criteria imprecise, what does ‘suitable’ mean?</li> </ul> <p>HE1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting the development in Rangemore to no more than 6 dwgs on any one site and 4 in Tatenhill may be too prescriptive at it doesn’t take into account the scale of the dwellings relative to the site.</li> <li>• Reference to up to 4 dwellings within the rural areas in accordance with HE3 should state specifically that it</li> </ul>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>relates to conversion of existing buildings and not new builds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We consider the policy quite complex with regard to the various limitations in terms of absolute numbers, distribution, local needs and rolling 5 year permissions. The '12 permissions in any 5 year rolling period' we consider quite difficult to monitor and deliver. Would it be better to have a strict-ish criteria based policy for development over 25 dwellings? We realise this policy has changed considerably since draft plan stage and the negotiation with the community group and residents has probably made the policy complicated.</li> <li>• ESBC's Housing Strategy manager considers: The quantum, distribution, and capping of housing development set out in policy HE1 have not been justified, since there is no obvious relationship to the published Housing Needs Survey results. They are therefore open to challenge. There should be a reference to policy HE2 to make clear that applications will need to satisfy both policies.</li> </ul> <p>HE2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESBC welcomes the desire to secure housing for older people, housing for newly forming households, and 50% affordable housing. However the published Housing Need Survey Report does not justify this mix of housing, and the policy is therefore open to challenge. I recommend publishing further evidence from the survey to justify the specified mix. The Borough Council will require such evidence to support applications for housing development and hence publishing will</li> </ul>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>facilitate development of the housing needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy refers to the strategic policies of the NP but it should also refer to HE1 (as in 6.9), otherwise it appears to permit development separately from HE1.</li> </ul> <p>HE3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'where demonstrated unviable, additional new build residential or live/work units may be permitted to support conversion of traditionally built redundant complexes' - this seems potentially risky as it could invite proposals for new build. It is also not necessarily compatible with recently introduced permitted development rights for conversion of rural buildings as these do not restrict the type of building which could be converted i.e. could be modern, not necessarily traditional.</li> </ul> <p>HE4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy may be better worded to include a caveat that any other uses must not adversely affect the vitality and viability of existing centres.</li> </ul> <p>HE5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete "and only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that no other viable industrial or commercial use is possible" as there is no industrial allocation on this site.</li> <li>Large scale growth of the aerodrome cannot be controlled given the unfettered planning history of the site. This statement would therefore be better deleted.</li> <li></li> </ul> <p>RT1 – RT4 no comment LC1</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For information, there is no control over landscape planting unless it is part of a development proposal (which is we believe what the policy acknowledges). Therefore gaps could be filled in with planting outside any development proposal.</li> </ul> <p>LC2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference to strategic green gaps is not required within the policy as this is repeating the Local Plan. The reference states that development would not be permitted – this is not in conformity with the emerging Local Plan policy which would allow some development which would not impact on the openness of the green gap.</li> </ul> <p>LC3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to other relevant policies within the NP should be added, as National Forest planting will presumably not simply be acceptable per se if it conflicts with another policy in the plan.</li> </ul> <p>DC1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are not sure all buildings should front onto the road as there are examples already of buildings being sideways on and these are part of the character of the village.</li> <li>• The term ‘backland development’ is normally used as a negative term when refusing applications so possibly don’t use it in the policy.</li> <li>• Delete ‘unless they are a specific design detail’ from point 5 (does not add anything to the policy)</li> <li>• Add ‘distinctiveness’ in para 9.5 as it is part of local character</li> </ul>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 'high quality materials' as well as high quality design as these may be better in terms of long-term cost and maintenance.</li> </ul> <p>DC2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy states there is a compromise between off street parking and losing hedges (which is difficult to prevent). Restricting off street parking could lead to and increase in on street parking on narrow streets through the village.</li> </ul> <p>DC3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 'setting' at the end of para 1, last sentence "...make a positive contribution to the local character, <b>setting</b> and sense of place."</li> <li>• Para 9.13 – Again 'setting' needs to be used – "...enhance the <b>character, integrity and setting</b> of both the Conservation Area and any affected listed buildings."</li> <li>• We are not convinced that the policy should include 'and the views of the community'</li> </ul> <p>IN1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We question whether the parish would want A1-5 uses in community buildings. In theory the parish Church could be converted into a takeaway with this policy.</li> </ul> <p>IN2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PP is not required for highway works carried out by a statutory undertaker i.e. the highway authority, therefore is there a need for this policy?</li> </ul> <p>IN3 – no comment</p>	
R6	J and W	Whole document and sp. HE1 and	We support every policy/objective in this well-structured,	yes



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
	Westlake, Tatenhill	HE2	<p>detailed &amp; widely consulted Neighbourhood plan that has been excellently crafted <b>with the exception of the Housing Policies HE1 and HE2.</b></p> <p><b>HE1</b>The number of 10 homes permitted for development in the next 15 years for Tatenhill Village alone is substantially less than in the previous 20 years (which we estimate to be close to 25 houses). How can these restrictions in numbers allow for growth needed to sustain the community? All Saints CE Primary school now has only 50% of pupils from within catchment area, more family homes within the catchment area villages of Tatenhill &amp; Rangemore are needed for the school to thrive. The village Church of St Michael and All Angels is on the brink of likely closure. Unless this community has an injection of several young families over the coming years it is likely to become a commuter village with an aging demographic and the few community assets such as school and church that we do have may not be sustainable and face closure.</p> <p><b>HE2</b>The numbers of houses permitted for development on any one site in Tatenhill village are limited to a maximum of 4 with 50% of these expected to be affordable homes and there is an expectation that these sites also offer some sort of community benefit at the same time.The restrictions are so tight in the draft plan that the financial viability of any such development is questionable leading to the conclusion that the numbers put forward in policy HE2 are not realistic enough to be deliverable. A maximum of 5 homes with 20% affordable would be a more realistic and deliverable quota.</p>	
R7	Paul Chamberlain	Two Parts both relating to Rangemore.	I support the proposed new conservation area boundary. Specifically, it is unclear to me why the buildings on the eastern edge of	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
	Rangemore	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The indicated conservation area on map page 68 in the Draft Submission May214 Rev. A</li> <li>2. The philosophy implied within statement DC1, page 44 in the same document.</li> </ol>	<p>Rangemore, which are adjacent to Tatenhill Lane, are not within the current conservation area. Some of these dwellings include designs similar to those on Chapel Lane which are within the current conservation area. The same could be said for many of the outlying houses.</p> <p>DC1. I am concerned about some of the implications within this statement. There is a suggestion that “traditional” styles are the only way forward. Many beautiful villages have a wide variety of architectural styles which have been developed over centuries. To potentially apply a design (style) brake on future developments could be short sighted.</p> <p>Example 1. Glass was expensive and thermally poor, hence window apertures tended to be small. Modern glazing materials can provide excellent thermal properties thus enabling a building which provides a significantly different aspect from those currently prevalent in the village. Well designed buildings which include significant glazed areas can be sensitively introduced and add to the character of the village. This could also easily be applied to existing buildings. For example some observers find 17 to 27 Chapel Lane a little brutish in design. Personally I don’t find them offensive. However, revised window apertures (larger or repositioned) could provide a quite different effect. Such developments should be considered favourably.</p> <p>Example 2. Imposing a “traditional style” on a new or existing development can look incongruous. A 1980s or 2020s house with a half timbered frontage looks just that (a new house with a pretend old bit stuck on). It is an inappropriate anachronism. Modern buildings with Georgian style windows and porches could be viewed in a similar manner. Good new design and traditional designs can sit side by side for the enjoyment of current, and future, generations.</p>	
R8	Judy Tjon Soei Len, Clerk to Anslow Parish	Transport	Anslow Parish Council support concerns regarding road infrastructure and increase in traffic caused by local development and we would endorse and work with	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
	Council		<p>neighbouring Parishes to improve this position.</p> <p>Anslow Parish Council would encourage the NDP to have sufficient focus on the increased traffic and inadequacy of existing roads to cope with the surrounding housing developments.</p>	
R9	Jane Bristow, Tatenhill	Whole document	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Development Plan. I fully support its Vision and Objectives and also the Policies which form the main part of this plan.</p> <p>These Policies were formulated after long and careful consultation with the residents of the Parish and it is vital that these views are taken into account when considering any future development.</p>	yes
R10	Paul Brown	<p>Housing Development for Rangemore and Tatenhill</p> <p>Extension of runway for Tatenhill Aerodrome</p> <p>Traffic Calming for Rangemore and Tatenhill</p> <p>Lawns farm, greening and control of traffic</p> <p>St Georges Park and contribution to community and to sympathetically blending in building to countryside</p>	<p>I thank all who contributed to this document. A lot of work has gone into this and as a lay person, I am sometimes amazed at the complexity of the procedure behind this.</p> <p>We are both now semi retired persons, having both worked for the majority of our lives outside of our Parish, in some instances with extensive travel outside to the large cities, including London and Birmingham. We have always enjoyed being able to escape the urban rat race to return to my home area (grew up and schooled locally) and its tranquility. The recent consultations and plans and reported needs for development that would potentially jeopardise that tranquility have alarmed us.</p> <p>We intend to now work from home in an entrepreneurial self</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>employed form and the peace of this area appeals to us. We do not wish to see this jeopardized.</p> <p>Hence, we would like to commend all of the work that has gone into producing the Neighbourhood plan documents and its measured rational approach to work with all for compromise solutions.</p> <p>Our stance and position can be given as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Remain concerned about the lack of protected green space around Chapel Lane to the East and West, when other areas in Rangemore have this. I understand there will be limited development at the end of Chapel lane, were this to be in the vernacular, and be of very small scale and sympathetic, we would have to live with this. However increased traffic in Chapel lane making it increasingly difficult to leave our drive would concern us</li> <li>-Traffic through Rangemore is of concern, dangerous, especially as this has increased as a result of St Georges. Speed is also of concern, especially as there is a junior school here</li> <li>-Remain concerned that Lawns farm has not attempted to blend in as well as it could to the landscape. This could be addressed with the appropriate use of painting, natural greens and browns to blend into the landscape instead of vivid blue roves.</li> <li>-Remain concerned about the blending in of the Burton Rugby club, with stands, flood lighting and the impact that will have on the overall landscape</li> <li>-Remain concerned that Tony Higgot has put a site up for</li> </ul>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>consideration at the corner of Dunstall Lane and Moores Hill, a very characteristic village meadow, which forms an integral beautiful vista for Tatenhill.</p> <p>-Remain concerned about the impact of Lawns farm, the traffic and its greening with respect to the lane. Also the potential threat of HGV traffic coming through our villages, should a strengthened canal bridge materialize at Branston.</p> <p>-Concerned about runway extension to Tatenhill Aerodrome, and the increase use of twin engine planes and the noise and disturbance impact this would have to our peace and enjoyment of our property.</p> <p>-I agree with all of the comments made by Jim Allen, our next door neighbour</p> <p>-We have all mostly chosen Rangemore and Tatenhill for its peace and rural characteristic, and wish this to remain their conditions for the foreseeable future. In this vain, where to the best extent, the documents seek to strike compromise, we can view that favourably.</p> <p>-We do however wish to express our views of concern on the comments, that development of 4 houses could happen rather quickly, and at the front end of the time frame, rather than the back end of the time frame. This seems to be more than is being suggested too. Hence would appeal for clarification</p> <p>-Consultation on plans and our community being able to have input into design to ensure fit and suitability for the respective villages. We appeal to have this ability to provide input into this.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
R11	Staffordshire Parish Councils Association, Stafford	Section 3.0 "Vision and Objectives"	<p>SPCA is pleased to endorse the submission of the Tatenhill Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council was recently awarded first prize in the Association's "Excellence in Community Service" scheme. Tatenhill's success highlights the way in which a local council can make a difference to its community and improve the lot of its residents. The Parish Council has secured the endorsement of an increase in the precept levied on electors by demonstrating excellent value for money. The work undertaken in Tatenhill clearly fulfils the objectives of the Government's "Localism" agenda and reflects how a community can, in having a Council determined to engage positively with its electors, be empowered to achieve significant results.</p> <p>The submission of the NDP is another important step which demonstrates the pro-active engagement of the Parish Council with the community it serves.</p>	yes
R12	Coal Authority	Whole document	<p>Thank you for the email of the 9 June 2014 consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <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 to ensure that it is built safely 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 Tatenhill parish area is outside of the current defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has <b>no specific</b></p>	No

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p><b>comments</b> to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.</p> <p>The Coal Authority wishes the Parish Council every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
R13	Andrew Halden Community Council for Staffordshire	Whole document	<p>The Community Council is pleased to see the community and the Parish Council taking an active role in planning for the future of the area.</p> <p>We can see from the Plan that considerable time and effort has gone into its production and we are pleased to see the range of events that have taken place to engage and involve the community as a whole.</p> <p>The plan appears to be forward thinking and in many places it recognises the need for communities , and in particular rural communities , to embrace change and plan for this to take place in a constructive manner .</p> <p>Subject to the plan receiving the support of the wider community we are confident that this will make a useful contribution to the sustainability of the area .</p>	yes
R14	Peter and Carol Cooper, Tatenhill	Whole document	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is welcome as it builds upon the Tatenhill Parish Plan 2011 and the Parish Design Statement of the following year.</p> <p>The process has been inclusive, and everyone with an interest in the Parish has had several opportunities to become involved. An ambitious and mainly practical Plan has emerged.</p>	no

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>We support the vision and objectives, along with Strategic policies and those on Recreation and Tourism, Landscape and Countryside, Design and Conservation and Infrastructure.</p> <p>The Housing and Employment policies seek to tread the difficult path of growing the Parish's communities and economy, whilst retaining its unique characteristics. In most ways they succeed, and we support Policies HE2, HE3, HE4 and HE5 in their entirety.</p> <p>Whilst the principles of HE1 represent the need to provide a range of well designed housing development to sustain our communities, and provide for young people and the elderly who wish to remain locally, they fail the test of practicality for Tatenhill Village. For Rangemore, they can deliver a mix of homes, including for the younger and older generation, because of agreement between the main landowner and residents.</p> <p>Housing allocations were always going to be contentious, but it essential to grow Tatenhill to help develop its community. It is vital to provide a limited number of accommodation units for the next generation and elderly, so that they are not forced out of the village. There are limited sites within the village, and the policy will make it almost impossible for the intended accommodation to be delivered.</p> <p>In HE1, the number of new dwellings (including conversions) within Tatenhill Village should be raised to 15, and up to 6 on any one site should be allowed, as with Rangemore. If all are built over 17 years, the character of the village will not be impaired.</p> <p>These changes would however go a long way to ensuring sufficient sites come forward, and that they are viable to fund the number of starter and elderly persons and affordable dwellings suggested. It is</p>	



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>not necessary to limit the number of dwellings in any period of the local plan, as the policies and market conditions will naturally regulate the speed of development.</p> <p>In order to aid certainty, it may be more appropriate to return to named sites in the villages, as was the case in an earlier draft. It may also be appropriate to consider development boundaries for the two villages.</p> <p>Finally, we would reinforce the importance of Policy LC2:- here "Protected Green Spaces" are added to build on the Strategic Green Spaces set out in the East Staffordshire Local Plan. These are important not only to protect key views, but also with the proposal for Lawns Farm, to prevent the village being joined to Burton and Branston. It is concerning to note that at the end of a long processes to develop both a Neighbourhood Plan and the Borough Local Plan, that a possible senior school site has been identified on Branston Road Tatenhill, a suggested protected green site.</p>	
R15	Branston Parish Council	Whole document	It is very comprehensive. The parish council supports the policy protecting Battlestead Hill.	no
R16	Robert Hill, Tatenhill	Whole document	I wish to add my support to the Tatenhill and Rangemore Neighbourhood Plan. I believe the process and consultation has been thorough and inclusive and has culminated in something the area can use to build a more cohesive community.	no
R17	C and M Pitchfork, Tatenhill	Whole document	<p>We would make the following comments on the Tatenhill Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We have followed the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan closely, having attended several public meetings and taken</p>	no

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>every opportunity to make observations.</p> <p>Having lived in Tatenhill for almost 35 years, we have been in favour of it not being over developed, but are supportive of it continuing to grow incrementally, as long as new properties are in keeping with the village. We are strongly in support of accommodation for the young and the elderly. We ourselves are now at the time of life when we need smaller accommodation, however we do not wish to leave the village, as some people have been forced to do. The problem is that the housing proposals for the Village are over restrictive. Limiting the total number of additional dwellings to 10, with no more than 4 on any site and a maximum of 12 across the whole Parish within any rolling 5 year period, will clearly prevent sites coming forward in the near future. We may well be getting close to the Queen's telegram before seeing additional elderly persons accommodation being built.</p> <p>The proposals in the Plan for Tatenhill are well intentioned and with a little more thought it should be possible to provide the intended homes, without spoiling our village.</p>	
R18	Helena Pointer Parish Councillor Tatenhill Parish Council	Whole document	I would like to offer my support for the NDP. I feel that the plan is representative of local residents' views and that the process for compiling the plan has been inclusive. The draft plan was amended to take into account all views and I think is robust and will be accepted when taken to referendum.	no
R19	William Westlake, Tatenhill	Whole document	As a young member of the parish, I was very grateful that the organisers of the plan had consultation events just for young people. It was good to have our opinions listened to and points	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>I, my siblings and other young people raised are reflected in this plan.</p> <p>It was good to note the inclusion of the promotion of the history and heritage of the parish, the protection of the countryside and environment. The younger participants wanted better provision for play areas, in Tatenhill especially. We'd also like to feel connected to other places with safe cycling routes and a regular bus service to town. It is important to protect our community from big developers, but we do need some changes to keep the place alive.</p>	
R20	Philip Coleman Tatenhill	Whole document	<p>In response to the consultation process for the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan, I have been involved in various consultations and meetings during its development and have been impressed with the process.</p> <p>I entirely support its conclusions and proposals.</p>	no
R21	Tatenhill Parish Council	Whole document	<p>As the Statutory body Tatenhill Parish Council has submitted this document for consultation, examination and eventually a referendum in the parish.</p> <p>At the risk of stating the obvious Council wishes to reiterate its support and endorsement of both the document as a whole and the underlying process.</p> <p>Council is confident that this is the result of extensive community-wide consultation. All who wished to have been offered ample opportunity to contribute to this historic document. Their participation has been welcomed and contributed to the Plan.</p> <p>Council looks forward to receiving the Independent Examiner's</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			report and recommendation in due course.	
R22	A Dickins, Rangemore	Whole document	I am in complete support of this plan, it is a true representation of the community and its desire to retain what makes it a rural and desirable environment, whilst recognising the changes and developments needed over the next 20 years. It highlights the key issues facing our community with the massive 'town' being in the pipeline at lawns Farm which will undoubtedly force even more speeding traffic through village – here's hoping 'people power' can work.	yes
R23	Celia Addison, Rangemore	Whole document	This is very good for the Parish and gives us (the locals) a say in the future. This will keep the villages as villages and stop the new buildings that everyone wants to build! ESBC needs to listen to the people more.	yes
R24	Diane Milner, Rangemore	Whole document	This Plan enables the local population to have a real say in the planning and views of this area. ESBC are too busy looking after businesses to understand real people and this gives 'us' not businesses a real say. I would like to state that the conservation area extension for both Tatenhill and Rangemore are brilliant. We just need ESBC and SCC to get up and do something about the traffic from/to FA centre and lawns farm. Both bad decisions by ESBC.	yes
R25	Jim Allen, Rangemore	New buildings and traffic	Only infill building within the Parish – only built in vernacular. Traffic to be controlled through Rangemore by Chicanes, Large hump outside school and speed limit to come down to 30mph.	yes
R26	Pat Emptedge, Rangemore	Traffic, Housing, character of the village	I am positive about all of the plan as it will help to keep the village. I am very worried about the traffic as it is now a race track since the FA centre was built. I would like to ask if there are any housing in the village that it should be old buildings	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			first, then and only then new – but a very small amount – 2.	
R27	Vicki Allan, Rangemore	New buildings Traffic	Only converted buildings i.e. barns and new buildings built in correct aesthetic and the correct vernacular. Chicanes x 2 Large hump outside school Speed reduction to 30mph	Yes
R28	Paul Rouse, Savills. On behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster	1.5 Status of the NDP 1.12 Developing the NDP 5.2 strategic policies OBJECTION Grouped together as the same issue applies to all	<p>The Plan is stated to have been prepared in accordance with the emerging East Staffordshire Local Plan which is now at the Submission stage and would have been pre-submission when the NDP was drafted. The NDP does not state anywhere that it was prepared in accordance with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, which is the statutory requirement, and it appears that many of the policies of the NDP are not in accordance with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. A number of the detailed policies in respect of which representations are made are objected to for this specific reason. It appears that regard has not been given to the development plan in preparing the NDP.</p> <p>At the current time the adopted development plan is the Saved policies of the East Staffordshire Local Plan July 2006 – Saved Policies extended beyond 20 July 2009. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Schedule 4B 8(2) as amended, it is necessary for the NDP to meet the Basic Conditions. This requires the NDP to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>It is also necessary to consider whether the NDP is appropriate in the context of national policy and guidance issued by the Secretary of State. That policy and guidance includes the NPPF and the NPPG. The NPPF para 184 and NPPG 41-009-20140306 reconfirm the statutory test of compliance with the strategic policies of the development plan and the NPPG confirms that the NDP should NOT be tested against the policies in the emerging plan although it may be helpful to seek close alignment with emerging policies.</p> <p>The NDP should be reconsidered in the context of the development plan.</p>	
R29	Paul Rouse, Savills. On behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster	6.4 Tatenhill airfield SUPPORT	<p>The text identifies Tattenhill Airfield as a current employment site supporting a range of industries from aerospace to logistics (use class B8). The text states that the community wishes to retain and enhance these employment uses on this site. A wide range of uses is stated to be supported.</p> <p>As noted on the separate objection to HE5, the site specific policy does not reflect and is contrary to the objective set out at 6.4 at the start of the Housing and Employment chapter.</p> <p>It is important for the successful future operation of the airfield that unnecessary restriction is not placed upon the expansion or flexibility of the employment operations on the site and that</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			the policies of the NDP support the objective set out at 6.4 to retain and enhance the employment uses on the site.	
R30	Paul Rouse, Savills. On behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster	HE2. Local Housing need OBJECTION	<p>HE2 sets a policy for 50% affordable housing provision on sites of 2 or more dwellings. This requirement is not in general conformity with the relevant policy (H12) of the development plan which should be the case, as the objection to 1.5 Status of the NDP, 1.12 Developing the NDP and 5.2 Strategic Policies sets out. Nor is the policy consistent with the emerging Local Plan SP17.</p> <p>Local Plan policy H12 sets an unspecified percentage of affordable housing and applies only to sites of 25 dwellings or more. The percentage to be applied is to be determined in accordance with local need. In this sense Local Plan policy H12 should be considered a strategic policy because it relates to a strategic issue and has borough wide effect. The NDP affordable housing policy for local need is required to be in general conformity with ESLP policy H12.</p> <p>In accordance with the related objection to 1.5, 1.12 and 5.2, the NDP must be considered with regard to national policy and guidance. NDP policy HE2 as drafted is likely to threaten the viability of housing development in Tattenhill Neighbourhood Area, and is therefore in conflict with NPPF paras 173 and 174. At these paragraphs the NPPF sets out clearly that affordable housing requirements should not threaten viability and should</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>allow competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable.</p> <p>At the levels of affordable housing provision stated, the implementation of the housing elements of the NDP is at serious risk, as no housing site of more than a single unit is likely to be viable. There is no evidence with the NDP that the level of affordable housing provision sought is viable.</p> <p>Policy HE2 should therefore be amended to reflect the development plan and to import flexibility to ensure the implementation of the NDP remains viable.</p>	
R31	Paul Rouse, Savills. On behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster	HE3 – disused farms/outbuildings OBJECTION	<p>The policy sets requirements for the re-use of agricultural buildings including a hierarchy of preference and tests before residential use is deemed acceptable. This hierarchy and pre-condition tests are not in conformity with the Town and Country (General Permitted Development)(Amendment and Consequential Provisions)(England) Order 2014 which came into effect on 6 April 2014.</p> <p>Whilst the fact that development is permitted without the need for planning permission means that the NDP policy will in many cases be irrelevant, it would be better if there is to be a policy on re-use of agricultural buildings and farms for the NDP to be consistent with national statute.</p>	yes



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>The national policy of the NPPF is also more permissive than NDP policy HE3. At para 28 the NPPF states that <b>all</b> types of business and enterprise in <b>rural</b> areas should be supported, both through conversion of <b>existing</b> buildings and <b>new</b> buildings [our emphasis]. At para 55 the NPPF states that housing in rural areas is supported in special circumstances such as the re-use of redundant and disused buildings.</p> <p>The NDP policy should therefore be amended to reflect permitted development rights, and where a proposal may be outside the scope of the Permitted Development rights, the NPPF policy principles should apply. It is relevant to deviate from the Local Plan in this context as the statutory position and guidance has changed significantly since the Local Plan policies were saved.</p>	
R32	Paul Rouse, Savills. On behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster	HE5 – airfield OBJECTION	<p>The policy relates to Tattenhill Airfield as defined on the proposals map in the NDP. The definition of the Airfield is not in conformity with the definition of the Airfield in the development plan, and does not reflect the operational extent of the airfield. The development plan defines a larger area for the airfield and the NDP should be amended to comply with the enlarged definition.</p> <p>Draft policy HE5 seeks to restrict the development of B2 and B8 uses at the airfield and imposes pre-condition tests. These</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>restrictions conflict with the NDP stated objectives for the continued and enhanced employment provision at the Airfield, for a wider range of uses, which the NDP identifies as an important site. The related support to NDP para 6.4 refers.</p> <p>Saved Local Plan Policy T13 is more permissive in so far as proposals will be assessed on their merits, with the supporting text stating that new and replacement airport facilities will be acceptable in principle. The development plan policy places no restriction on use class. This general approach is more in line with the more up to date NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out a para 14 of that document, which should apply to the Airfield.</p> <p>The following paragraphs of the NPPF should also be noted and reflected in the NDP policy: p19 the planning system should act to encourage sustainable growth, not act as an impediment to it; p20 LPA's should plan proactively to meet the needs of business; p21 investment should not be over burdened by planning policy expectations, and plans should proactively encourage sustainable economic growth, and support existing business sectors; p28 planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas and Local and Neighbourhood Plans should support growth and expansion of <b>all</b> types of business and enterprise in rural areas.</p> <p>The draft NDP policy is also not in conformity with Submitted Draft Local Plan policy S08, SP1, SP3 and SP14. It would be beneficial for NDP policy HE5 to reflect these emerging Local Plan policy objectives.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>NDP policy HE5 should be amended to remove restrictions on uses and to set a permissive supportive and proactive stance towards development at the Airfield. The area to which the policy relates should also be extended to reflect the boundary in the development plan. The related objection to 1.5, 1.12 and 5.2 sets out why these changes are necessary.</p>	
R33	Mark Parkinson, Staffordshire Borough Council	Several policies and general comments	<p>Thank you for consulting Staffordshire County Council on the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). We have reviewed the Plan and are broadly supportive. Though we do have the following comments to make, which include recommendations for improvements to the plan. We also feel it necessary to identify to the Parish that there is land within the Parish boundary that forms part of the site search for a new Secondary School for Burton:</p> <p><b>Education</b></p> <p>With regards to schooling the Parish boundary falls over the following school catchment areas either fully or partly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Saints CE(C) Primary School</li> <li>• Needwood CE(VA) Primary School</li> <li>• John Taylor High School – A Science and Leadership Academy</li> </ul> <p>Residential development can increase the number of school-aged children living in an area and additional school places may be</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>required to accommodate these children. Where this is the case, developers will be asked to provide education contributions towards these additional school places. The proposals for the number of dwellings within the NDP are fairly low, up to 25 dwellings with 7 of these being proposed for elderly residents. Therefore, it is anticipated that any impact on school places will be addressed via S106 and/or CIL. However, should this change we may need to revisit this position.</p> <p>The birth rate in Burton has increased and there were insufficient school places available across schools in Burton to accommodate the number of children born over the last four years. To accommodate the increased pupil numbers the County Council has invested over £20 million to implement proposals to provide an additional 930 places from September 2013 to alleviate the significant pressure on primary school places in Burton in relation to the increase in births. This will meet the projected demand for places from pupils that already live within the area but will not be sufficient to accommodate pupils generated from any future residential developments.</p> <p>We have been working with East Staffordshire Borough Council to address the education infrastructure needs for the Town over the plan period. Background evidence reports can be accessed via <a href="http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/education/schoolsandcolleges/PlanningSchoolPlaces/Education-studies/Education-">http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/education/schoolsandcolleges/PlanningSchoolPlaces/Education-studies/Education-</a></p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p><a href="#">studies.aspx</a></p> <p>It has been determined that there is a need to provide a new secondary school to the west of the A38. A report into suitable and potentially available sites has been commissioned and provided a shortlist of options for consideration. One of the potential sites is situated in the Parish of Tatenhill South of Branston Road; adjacent to the permitted Rugby Club site see AMEC Study figure 4.2 site 17.</p> <p>We would like to liaise further with the Parish Council on this matter as options are considered.</p> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <p>With regards to Policies IN2 and IN3 the County Council will continue to work closely with the Parish council through our community highway liaison teams. Once CIL is adopted by the Borough the Parish Council will gain 25% of CIL from development in the Parish directly, which could be utilised to help fund the infrastructure policy requirement.</p> <p><b>Historic Environment</b></p> <p><b>General Comment</b></p> <p>The importance of the parish's history and archaeology is</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>mentioned at certain points throughout the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and this, coupled with the local historic landscape character and historic built environment does inform the unique sense of place for the area. However, it is not clear whether the NDP is underpinned by an appraisal of the evidence for understanding the historic environment and its significance within the parish. If such an appraisal has not been produced it may be deemed useful to undertake such a piece of work to understand the history of the parish, the location of heritage assets (as defined by Appendix 3: Glossary of the NDP) and their significance in order to underpin the policies and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan; this may be best undertaken as a later appendix to the plan.</p> <p>Furthermore this work could then also form the basis for the proposed Heritage Trails and interpretation panels (Policy RT2). Guidance to understanding the heritage of place can be found on English Heritage’s website: <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improve-your-neighbourhood/survey-your-neighbourhood">http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improve-your-neighbourhood/survey-your-neighbourhood</a> The fundamental evidence base for the historic environment is the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER). The NDP does not need to specifically reference the HER at all points where historic environment considerations are discussed, but it should highlight it as an important dataset for any developer looking to undertake work within the NHP boundary. Early consultation of the HER and engagement with relevant specialists by potential developers (or their representatives) is to be encouraged to prepare an informed</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>and sustainable proposal and may also reduce risk where archaeological remains are concerned.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b>  This section identifies very specific aspects of the landscape without reference to other elements which complement and provide context to the woodlands, brooks, streams and farmland, however, it is noted that they are identified as being of significance elsewhere in the NDP. The Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) of the county, a project carried out by Staffordshire County Council with funding from English Heritage, identifies that the field patterns across the parish are generally well-preserved and are also a legacy of the development of land management over the centuries. The settlement pattern, including the villages, hamlets, scattered farmsteads and road pattern, also contributes to this historic character and history. It is therefore advised that consideration of the field pattern and settlement pattern also be included within this section.</p> <p><b>History and Conservation</b>  The NDP should note that there is considerable archaeological potential from the surrounding area including extensive evidence for a late prehistoric ceremonial and burial landscape occupying the valley of the River Trent to the east of Tatenhill.  There may be further evidence for late prehistoric activity on higher land further away from the river corridor including in the Tatenhill area and this should be highlighted within the</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>current NHP or be highlighted in any follow-up work for example the appraisal suggested above.</p> <p>The NDP does not appear to draw a difference between designated and non- designated heritage assets. The existence of a designated heritage asset will materially affect the degree of protection afforded at a national and local level and should be considered as part of this document.</p> <p>It is also advised, for the sake of consistency, that the term heritage assets is used in preference to ‘historical assets’</p> <p><b>Vision and Objectives</b></p> <p>The NDP highlights (s3.1) the role that the historic environment can play in developing the community’s sense of place; this recognition is to be supported. To continue this theme the NHP may choose to highlight potentials for the enhancement of heritage assets or the improvement of access to the history of the settlement through interpretation which future developments may afford.</p> <p>Interpretation of the parish’s historic environment is identified within RT2 – Designated Trails (Gym, heritage) and the proposed provision of information/interpretation boards is to be encouraged. These must be informed by an evidence base as noted above.</p> <p><b>The Cultural Landscape</b></p> <p>This objective does not make clear what is meant by ‘local</p>	



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>landscape features', it is assumed that this includes settlement pattern (including road pattern and form) as well as woods and field patterns. It could also apply to associated features such as the extant ridge and furrow earthworks to be found around the villages in particular. Furthermore the objective also needs to make reference to the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment of the parish. The cultural landscape section should also reference areas of archaeological and historic significance.</p> <p><b>SP2 – Landscape Features</b></p> <p>Point 4 – It should be noted that the settlement pattern (villages, hamlets, farmsteads and roads) and woodland are also important to and reflect the local historic character along with the hedges and field patterns noted. These aspects should be highlighted in this point or should form a separate but linked point.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.10 should also note that the enhancement of existing hedgerows and trees would strengthen the local historic character.</p> <p>Historic hedgerows may be protected under the Hedgerows Regulations (1997).</p> <p><b>HE3 – Disused Farms/Outbuildings</b></p> <p>Many farm buildings are historically significant (and some may be designated) and as such, their reuse can be an</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>extremely sensitive issue. Proposals should be appropriate to the individual context of the farm building/s and the complex which they occupy. Any such proposals should be sympathetic and sustainable and consider their impact upon the surrounding landscape. Proposals should make use of the SCC Historic Farm Building Survey (held on the Staffordshire HER) and the ESBC design guidance for historic farm buildings in order to make informed decisions regarding reuse.</p> <p>It is noted that that the ESBC SPD on Historic Farm building Guidance is referenced elsewhere in the NDP. However, it could also be clearly referenced within this policy section or at least in the supporting text below.</p> <p><b>HE 5 Airfield</b></p> <p>It is advised that this policy and the supporting text reflect the fact that the airfield itself is a heritage asset and that there is the potential for further undesignated heritage assets (in the form of buildings and structures) to survive. Local plan policies may apply to these heritage assets and this should be noted in the text.</p> <p><b>DC3 - Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>The policy only makes reference to designated heritage assets and their settings (Conservation Areas and listed buildings). However, as is highlighted elsewhere in the plan, the historic environment makes an important contribution to the local</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>landscape character and settlement pattern across the parish. It is recommended that this is reflected in the policy and furthermore that reference be made in the supporting text to the fact that heritage assets also form the subject of strategic policies in NPPF and in the ESBC Local Plan.</p> <p>The NDP should also consider that views into and out of Conservation Areas must be considered as part of a planning application. As such, developments on the fringes of Conservation Areas which have been poorly designed may have a considerable detrimental impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p><b>Ecology</b></p> <p><b>2.0 Background to the Parish</b></p> <p>No mention of ecology or biodiversity is present in section 2.0 Background to the Parish which appears an omission, given reference to this in objective 3 and policy SP1 and the high biodiversity value of areas within the parish. As well as being within the National Forest, the parish falls mainly within the Needwood Woods and Parklands Ecosystem area. (Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan <a href="http://www.sbap.org.uk">http://www.sbap.org.uk</a>) where woodlands and parklands are the priority habitats. The scattered woodlands in the parish include several ancient woodlands which are remnants of the ancient Needwood Forest, particularly around Rangemore.</p> <p>Ancient woodlands represent some of the richest biodiversity</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>in the country. The parish also boasts significant stretches of species-rich hedgerow some of which are also remnants of the Needwood Forest. St Georges Park includes parkland with veteran trees of high value for wildlife and is one of several parklands in the parish. These woodlands, parklands, hedgerows and associated –habitats together make-up an interconnected landscape that supports many wildlife species such as bats, barn owls and brown hares. The eastern part of the parish is within the River Gravels Ecosystem Area where wetland habitats are important, such as that found at Branston Gravel Pits.</p> <p><b>3.0. Vision and Objectives</b></p> <p>Objective 3 for Biodiversity and Ecology is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework guidance in expressing the aim of preserving and enhancing biodiversity. Table 4.1, however, misses important linkages between a number of policies and objective 3. This includes policies SP1, SP2, SP3, HE3, RT2, LC2, LC3</p> <p>Objective 3 should be considered in applying policy SP1 (indeed biodiversity is cited in the policy), with the consideration of preserving and enhancing local ecological networks of habitats, as s.109 of the NPPF advises, particularly as Rangemore and Tatenhill are located within important habitat networks.</p> <p><b><i>Policy SP3 Contextually Responsive Design</i></b> could benefit from reference to inclusion of measures for biodiversity</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>within landscape design. It is assumed that the Parish Design Guide references the importance of assessment of roof spaces for use by bats when planning conversions to avoid inadvertent legal offences in a landscape of high value for this species group.</p> <p><b>Policy HE3 Disused Farms/Outbuildings:</b> it is strongly advised that supporting text refers to the likelihood that these buildings may support protected species such as bats and barn owls recorded in the parish, that these buildings should be assessed by a specialist ecologist when planning conversions, and that features for these species, and for breeding birds such as swallows and swifts that rely on buildings of this type, should be included in design where possible.</p> <p><b>Policy RT2 – Designated Trails:</b> there is potential for development of trails that include access to the parish’s rich biodiversity and interpretation of this</p> <p><b>Policy LC2 – Protected Green Spaces and Green Gap:</b> Reference to Sites of Biological Interest should read Sites of Biological Importance. In order to comply with the NPPF, reference to biodiversity outside these sites would be appropriate and to habitat networks. Note that several Biodiversity Alert Sites are also found within the parish; indeed some mark its boundary. These sites are of at least Parish importance; therefore reference to them in a Parish Plan would be appropriate. Further information about Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs) and Biodiversity Alert Sites</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>(BAS) can be obtained from Staffordshire Ecological Record <a href="http://www.staffs-ecology.org.uk">http://www.staffs-ecology.org.uk</a> <b>Policy LC3 – National Forest and Green and Blue Infrastructure</b> reflects well the position of the parish within the National Forest and the aims of the Forest for biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Proposals Map</b> Biodiversity Alert Sites are not shown on the Proposals Map, nor are ancient woodlands. Adding these might allow the Proposals Map to better express local natural heritage and show existing green infrastructure more effectively.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b> Reference to “Planning for Landscape Change” see <a href="http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/planner_s-developers/landscape/NaturalEnvironmentLandscapeCharacterTypes.aspx">http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/planner_s-developers/landscape/NaturalEnvironmentLandscapeCharacterTypes.aspx</a> would be welcomed. The quality of the landscapes of Staffordshire has been assessed and this information has been used to prepare supplementary planning guidance to help inform the planning process. This guidance is currently being updated.</p> <p><b>Forestry</b> The Plan has taken on board the National Forest objectives and its policies in a proactive way.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p><b>Rights of Way</b></p> <p>The aspirations to improve off road accessibility within the Parish are welcomed. The County Council is able to support certain path improvement schemes through the Community Paths Initiative which is a once yearly funding stream to improve the path network in parishes across the County.</p>	
R34	Pete Bolland, English Heritage	Whole document and specific policies	<p><b>TATENHILL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting English Heritage on the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan (NP). We are very impressed by the breadth and depth of policy coverage within the NP and fully supportive of its’ wide ranging content and laudable objectives.</p> <p>English Heritage also considers overall that the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan has a quite comprehensive historic</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>environment evidence base, which covers the characteristics of the settlement and the surrounding landscape and the component designated and undesignated heritage assets in some considerable detail. This is also to be applauded although it is notable that the evidence is not readily found within the NP itself but rather is resident in separate (albeit directly related) documents particularly the excellent Tatenhill and Rangemore CAAAMP's and the East Staffordshire Design Guide and detailed Parish Design Guide SPD's.</p> <p>Whilst this is not highly problematic it does require very clear signposting to alert both the general reader and perhaps particularly developers, at whom the policy guidance is largely aimed, that the detail required to inform their proposals is to be found in a number of separate locations.</p> <p>We would suggest a short introductory section is introduced to the NP stating that the Plan must be read in conjunction with the CAAAMP's and which also states unequivocally that in preparing Design and Access Statements developers will be required to make full use of the following check list of guidance (state what this is and provide hyperlinks) in formulating their proposals so as to produce complementary designs that sustain and enhance local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>In the same vein, it seems apparent the County Council</p>	



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Historic Environment Record (HER) has been consulted as a range of Heritage Assets, designated and undesignated have been identified but this is not stated in the NP. It would be helpful to make this statement and in the checklist refer developers to the HER (which is an evolving database rather than a static snapshot which the CAAAMP's represent) to check whether in any area of the Parish their proposals could affect any heritage assets that would need to be taken into account. It would also be pertinent for similar reasons for the checklist to reference the English Heritage guidance, the Staffordshire Historic Farmsteads Project that has been produced in conjunction with the County Council. It can be accessed via the following link:</p> <p><a href="https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/planners-developers/HistoricEnvironment/Projects/HistoricFarmsteadsandLandscapeCharacterinStaffordshireFeb2012.pdf">https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/planners-developers/HistoricEnvironment/Projects/HistoricFarmsteadsandLandscapeCharacterinStaffordshireFeb2012.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Again as a way of making information easily accessible to developers and others English Heritage recommend that use is made in the NP of a selection of map figures taken from the CAAAMP's. For instance, the figures highlighting listed buildings and historic development, character areas and townscape analysis are highly visual and informative and would provide a readily accessible context for people wishing to appreciate from the NP itself the essential character of Tatenhill and Rangemore.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>English Heritage also suggests that for extra emphasis and added weight the Neighbourhood Plan might usefully include a clear requirement set within the boxed text of each relevant policy for applicants for planning permission to clearly demonstrate in the preparation of their detailed development proposals and in Design and Access Statements that they have made positive use of all relevant guidance documents in the checklist provided (at section X of the NP). We suggest this could apply to policies SP1; SP2; SP3; Dc1; DC2; DC3;</p> <p>We also suggest that consideration be given to inserting the following paragraph into the boxed text for policy SP1 (or possibly SP3):</p> <p><b>“New development must take account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology, and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development. Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence and in all instances the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) held by the County Council should be consulted at an early stage in the formulation of proposals”.</b></p> <p>Within the boxed text of Policy HE3- Disused Farms/outbuildings it would be relevant to insert-</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p><b>“Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form. Due reference and consideration should be made to the Staffordshire Farmstead Assessment Framework and proposals should clearly demonstrate how the framework has been taken into account”.</b></p> <p>English Heritage has a number of relatively minor observations on the wording of some of the policies viz: Within SP2- Landscape Features, the first sentence refers to <b>“an integral natural resource”</b>. This is doubtless true but it is equally the case that landscape is an essentially man-made construct and therefore also a historic environment resource- for instance we note the farmsteads, hedgerows and field patterns cited later in the policy. We strongly recommend that this is reflected in the policy wording which should read <b>“an integral natural and historic environment resource”</b>.</p> <p>Within Policy DC1- Design in Conservation Areas, section I of the policy we would suggest that to achieve greater conformity with the CAAAMP's the words <b>“respecting the historic building line”</b> should be inserted after “...active frontages” and before “..and be orientated to”.</p> <p>Within Policy DC3- Heritage Assets, we believe there is a</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>lack of emphasis on undesignated heritage assets since these make a very important cumulative contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of any given area and are highly locally significant in that respect. In the first sentence of the policy we, therefore, strongly recommend that “or adjacent to listed buildings” is replaced by “<b>or where other Heritage Assets are affected</b>”.</p> <p>On a more general level English Heritage notes and highly commends the approaches taken to Views, Highway Works and Public Realm in policies LC1; IN2 and IN3.</p> <p>In conclusion, English Heritage consider that the Tatenhill Draft Neighbourhood Plan is a very positive document that has a solid evidence base, deals commendably thoroughly with the Historic Environment and contains a positive strategy for its’ conservation. In our view in this respect it is in line with the objectives of the governments National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We commend and support the Objectives and Policies in the final Plan subject only to the incorporation into the final document of the minor modifications suggested by ourselves, as set out above.</p> <p>I hope you find this advice helpful. Should you wish to discuss any points within this letter further please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
R35	Howard Sharp	Various	1. <u>General</u>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
	& Partners LLP on behalf of Providence Land Ltd and Richard Evans		<p>1.1 The Plan is supported in that it seeks to relate development proposals to community benefits that are set out in Appendix 1. It is suggested that the Plan would be improved by further research on the likely costs of these capital projects. When that is done there can be a realistic appraisal of the relevant policies. Some of the improvement works will be 'one off' items. For example the improvement to Tatenhill Memorial Hall will be best undertaken in one contract. If a figure can be placed upon this then it may have an impact upon the drafting of some of the other policies. It will assist the Plan to relate benefits to the schemes that are likely to come forward. For example Policy HE1 has much to commend it but may be over restrictive when considered in the context of enabling development. If, for example, the Tatenhill Memorial Hall project required an</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>immediate input of £200,000 to allow for the extension of the hall, removal of some existing cladding, redecoration and landscaping, it would be sensible to undertake it as one contract. There would be much merit in allowing a development that funded this. If consent was granted for 8 or 10 dwellings in Rangemore, Tatenhill Common and some elsewhere then the provision would have been absorbed and there would be little chance of anything more occurring until the second 5 year period when there would be another allowance. There are opportunities to achieve the community benefits but this may involve going outside the limited opportunities currently available under Policy HE1.</p> <p>To take another example Policy LC2 considers Green Spaces and the Green Gap. The policy is too restrictive at present as our clients are proposing a positive development that will enhance the gap and contribute to capital projects. Furthermore the reservation of these Green</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Spaces should meet the criteria of the NPPF and should not be used as a general restraint policy.</p> <p>1.2 Without some costing and operational plan it is difficult to see how the very desirable improvement and maintenance of the Churches can be achieved. This may be particularly important as there will be a likely need to provide for the community aspirations of the new residents in the Lawns Farm development who might join Tatenhill Church. But they will not be coming to the area for some years due to the inevitable time it takes for infrastructure provision. Is there a programme worked out within the PCC to create a fund for the next say 5 years to maintain the Ministry and viability of the Church? Perhaps, to give an example, a sinking fund of say £50,000 is needed to augment the stipend of the Minister for the area. All this needs to be worked through and the</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>various elements in the Plan linked.</p> <p>2.1 <u>Individual Policies</u></p> <p>2.2 Turning to the individual policies we set out suggestions which enable our clients to develop on the two areas marked on the Plan attached. The first site, although not within the Tatenhill Parish, is focused on Tatenhill Village. This is an appropriate development site. It is almost in a bowl and looks to the village and the existing development adjoining. As the first site is outside the parish there would have to be discussions with Branston Parish in respect of any benefits arising from the development. There would be mention in a comment to this effect in the Plan.</p> <p>2.3 The second site involves a significant package of proposals, strategic woodland, tennis facilities,</p>	



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>housing and either a capital sum or a property transferred to the parish to produce an income in perpetuity. Either the Parish Housing Strategy could be altered or a separate policy formulated for this site. The Housing Strategy could be altered as follows</p> <p>'The NDP supports the development of up to 25 dwellings (conversions and new build) over the planned period in locations focused towards Tatenhill and Rangemore Villages. The development should be spread over the period except in relation to any proposals definitely linked to the capital projects at Appendix 1. In addition the site for mixed housing, strategic woodland, capital deposits for future maintenance of tennis club facilities, footpath improvements, the village hall and other enabling development including that for the Church is shown at Branston Road the comprehensive development will form a permanent barrier between Tatenhill Village and the</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>residential development to the east.'</p> <p>The policy can then continue with the distribution paragraphs.</p> <p>2.1 <u>Other Policies</u></p> <p>RT3 should specifically mention the provision of land for the tennis facilities on Branston Road.</p> <p>Policy LC1 should refer to the permanent planting of the wedge as shown on the plan attached.</p> <p>Policy LC2 should be strengthened to refer to the wedge and the suggested wording is attached below.</p> <p>Policy IN1 should ideally specify the detail.</p> <p>Appendix 1 should have some price guides on the various items and also a Management Plan for future</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			maintenance of the various facilities.	
R36	Natural England	Specific and general	<p><b>Planning consultation:</b> Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Submission Consultation Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 09 June 2014</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p><u>Habitats Regulations Assessment</u></p> <p>We note that the outer edge of the Neighbourhood Plan area falls within the 15km Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Zone of Influence (ZOI). However, as no development is proposed within the ZOI in the Plan, we do not consider that the plan would result in likely significant effects on Cannock Chase SAC.</p> <p>Natural England advise that housing development that comes forward within the 15km Cannock Chase ZOI should be subject to screening under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (known as the 'Habitats</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Regulations').</p> <p>For more information concerning visitor impacts on Cannock Chase SAC and mitigation please see the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannock Chase SAC Visitor Impacts Mitigation Report, Footprint Ecology 2013, available online at:  <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4856/cannock_chase_sac_visitor_impacts_mitigation_report_february_2013">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4856/cannock_chase_sac_visitor_impacts_mitigation_report_february_2013</a></li> <li>• Cannock Chase SAC Visitor Survey (and separate Maps Annex), Footprint Ecology 2013, available online at:  <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4854/cannock_chase_sac_visitor_survey_february_2013">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4854/cannock_chase_sac_visitor_survey_february_2013</a>  <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4855/cannock_chase_sac_visitor_survey_map_annex_february_2013">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4855/cannock_chase_sac_visitor_survey_map_annex_february_2013</a></li> <li>• Cannock Chase SAC Impacts of Recreation Report, Footprint Ecology 2012, available online at:  <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4857/impacts_of_recreation_to_cannock_chase">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4857/impacts_of_recreation_to_cannock_chase</a></li> </ul> <p>—</p> <p>In addition please refer to our updated advice letters dated 23 September 2013 and 11 December 2013 (our ref Case 5912).  <u>Strategic Environmental Assessment</u>  By way of a correction we advise that Branston Park Nature Reserve lies adjacent to the Parish boundary as opposed to 1km</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>eastward but that this site is a locally designated Site of Biological Importance (SBI) and Local Nature Reserve and is not designated under European legislation. The closest European designated sites are River Mease SAC West Midland Mosses SAC, Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and Cannock Chase SAC which lie around 6km, 12.5km 12.5km and 14.5km from the parish respectively.</p> <p>In addition to European designated sites we advise that the screening should have considered impacts on nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). We note that Bracken Hurst SSSI lies less than 700m to the south east of the parish.</p> <p>Considering the nature and scale of development promoted in the Plan and on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, we advise that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests are concerned (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan.</p> <p><u>Updates to the Plan</u> This section of our response provides our comments on the updates to the Plan since our previous response. For our full comments on the plan this response should be read in conjunction with our previous response reference 101098, which has been provided for your ease of reference.</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the support for the protection and</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>enhancement of Sites of Biological Importance (SBI) in policy LC2 and the inclusion of them in the Proposals map in line with paragraphs 117 of the NPPF which makes it clear that planning policies should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity.</p> <p>We also welcome paragraph 3 of policy LC3 requiring demonstration of how planning applications contribute to and restore the overall biodiversity network within the parish including the addition of blue infrastructure to the policy wording.</p> <p>We note the introduction of policy SP4, Sustainability and Climate Change, we would welcome reference to the adaptation and vulnerability of species and habitats to climate change. For more information see our national biodiversity climate change vulnerability model (NBCCVM) available on the Natural England website:  <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/climateandenergy/climatechange/vulnerability/nationalvulnerabilityassessment.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/climateandenergy/climatechange/vulnerability/nationalvulnerabilityassessment.aspx</a></p> <p>For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter please contact Merlin Ash on 0300 060 4271. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to <a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a>.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
R37	Emma Coleman, Tatenhill	Whole document	<p>I have been closely involved in this process throughout. This appears to be a sound plan, detailed, comprehensive and concentrating on those areas <u>not</u> already closely regulated/protected by existing legislation or higher authority (eg European) Regulations. It has focussed on the areas highlighted by the residents during the extensive and comprehensive consultation period. It is certainly a more polished and focussed document than earlier drafts were.</p> <p>Personally, I am an unsure that the agreed Housing policies can actually deliver what is stated as being the need. But I am not a planner.</p> <p>The process has been interesting to watch and participate in. I struggle to get away from the idea that the whole process caught the Borough Council unprepared and that there have been stalling actions by the Borough to allow them to play catch up. Six months for area designation was just the start. Borough Councillor (NOT our Ward) actually confirmed my concerns last week, in open meeting.</p> <p>All the way through I have been concerned over the point at which “conformity” was measured with the Borough’s emerging plan. As we finally approach the end I remain concerned that the Borough will continue to put undue pressure on the final document to fit their plan rather than the wishes of the residents. Suggested changes to the texts are concerning.</p> <p>I look forward to reading the Independent Examiner’s report into our Plan.</p>	yes

<b>Representation number</b>	<b>Person or organisation</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Do they want to be informed of decision?</b>