

**Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan RE-SUBMISSION Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> August 2015 to Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2015**

**Regulation 16 representations**

<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>
TR001	East Staffordshire Borough Council	Various	<p><u>Introductory Statement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan was originally submitted to East Staffordshire Borough Council (under Regulation 16) and consultation took place between 9<sup>th</sup> June and 21<sup>st</sup> July 2014. It was subsequently examined by Nigel McGurk in August 2014. The Examiner, in his Report, made recommendations for changes which he considered were necessary for the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions. Having considered these, the Parish Council decided that, whilst many of the changes could be accepted, there were some changes that would result in the removal of a policy that had received strong support from the community during consultation. The Parish Council believed that the Plan with these changes made would result in a “No” vote at Referendum.</li> <li>2. Rather than withdraw the Plan and render the extensive work of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group abortive, the Parish Council has worked with ESBC to seek a positive solution. The Parish have taken on board the Examiner’s concerns, re-worked the wording of policies and provided additional evidence, working with ESBC throughout and taking on board advice given.</li> <li>3. ESBC, on their part, have taken legal advice on whether or not the local planning authority may allow the Plan to return to Submission (Regulation 16) stage with the amended Plan and for it to be re-examined. Counsel’s advice was that this was possible, subject to adhering to some procedural matters, and so ESBC made this decision in their Decision Statement (Regulation 18(1)) approved by Cabinet on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2015.</li> <li>4. ESBC believe that the Plan as it now stands, with the Examiner’s changes or Parish Council changes, as set out in the Decision Statement, meets the Basic</li> </ol>	-

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Conditions, and is happy for the Plan to be submitted for re-examination.</p> <p>5. ESBC recognises that this course of action is unprecedented. It has pointed out to the Parish Council that there will only be one opportunity to re-submit, and that the Examiner, being totally independent, may still regard the changed Plan as not meeting the Basic Conditions.</p> <p><u>Comments on the Parish Council's re-submitted Plan</u></p> <p>6. Policy HE1- We are aware that there is a difficult balance to be taken when a policy is inserted on the numbers of future dwellings in the parish. We have found that parishes have, in the main, been very positive in planning for housing, in line with the strategic housing distribution set out in the ESBC draft Local Plan. Tatenhill is no exception.</p> <p>7. On the one hand, we are mindful that the inclusion of a maximum figure contravenes government policy on housing provision. On the other hand, having taken on board the Local Plan's strategic figures and guidance on the appropriate number of homes, and having accepted that there will need to be further development beyond this in the future, the principle of localism should allow a parish to decide the most appropriate places for new development to take place and the <u>level</u> of development that will be appropriate without destroying the character of the parish and its settlements.</p> <p>8. We have advised Tatenhill and other parishes to use wording such as "approximately 25 dwellings" to indicate the order of magnitude of development without being prescriptive. Using the words "minimum of":</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) precludes support for developments of up to 9 dwellings – an important source of new housing in villages; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) could open the door for applications for very large developments that would swamp existing villages and destroy their character. For the larger</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>villages in the Borough (Tatenhill and Rangemore are not in this category) ESBC has already made large allocations of housing where it believes the local facilities can support such a major increase.</p> <p>9. New Para 6.9 – The Council’s Conservation Officer notes that redundant and disused buildings in Tatenhill Parish will mainly consist of agricultural buildings, but has heard that St Michael and All Angels (Grade II* listed) may soon be vacated.</p> <p>10. Policy HE2, new para 6.11 – The addition to this policy simply ensures consistency with the Local Plan policy. The current target figure in the draft Local Plan, Policy SP17 (Main Modifications consultation now finished, awaiting Inspector’s Report in early October 2015) is now 40%, not 30%, and we would suggest that the figure in Policy HE2 be amended accordingly. Otherwise, the Council believes the Policy meets the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>11. Policy HE5 – The additional sentence proposed by the Parish Council, in conjunction with the changes recommended by the Examiner, results in a positive policy that allows for business uses other than those preferred by the parish. The representatives of Tatenhill Airfield have had the opportunity to make further comments at re-submission, although at the first submission consultation they were in support of the policy as it was originally drafted.</p> <p>12. Para 8.2 –Village character is a matter considered of some importance in government planning policy, and locally, as set out in NPPF paras 58, 126 and 131 and draft Local Plan Policies14, 30 (for example) respectively. Apart from removing the reference to the Local Plan, the Parish Council wishes to retain the second sentence to emphasise the support given by higher levels of policy guidance.</p> <p>13. Policy LC2 - The protection of the Local Green Spaces is a fundamental part of the community’s wishes for the parish and therefore the neighbourhood plan. In the light of the Examiner’s comments each site put forward has now been more</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>thoroughly researched and a matrix prepared setting out how each site meets each of the criteria for LGSs in NPPF para 77. The Policy and its explanatory text have been completely re-written and the merits of each LGS included are thoroughly evidenced. ESBC endorses this approach and is happy that these sites can be re-submitted for examination. Tatenhill PC is keen for all the LGSs identified to be retained in the modified NP. ESBC are also keen for this to happen but are realistic and would like each LGS to be retained in the policy once the examiner is satisfied the site meets the LGS criteria and basic conditions. ESBC would like to see the policy retained, whether or not all the LGSs remain in the policy.</p> <p>14. Policy IN2 – Speeding through traffic is a considerable concern in the parish due to the volume of vehicles cutting across country to St George’s Park, often at dangerous speeds, and the fear that once the Lawns Farm development is developed so close to Tatenhill further large volumes of traffic will use the narrow lanes that characterise the parish. The policy has been re-written to link it to development, though clearly the Parish Council will be seeking as many different avenues as possible in addition to developer contributions in order to bring about traffic calming measures.</p> <p>15. The only reservation ESBC has on this Policy is the reference to “including the use of the Parish receipts from CIL”. It is not certain that ESBC will prepare a CIL Charging Schedule, and so it is suggested that this phrase be deleted.</p>	
TR002	Coal Authority		<p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it at this stage.</p>	-
TR003	Dr John Fawn	Local Green Space	I have been doing research into the history of the Parish. I believe that the proposed green space on Branston Road, Tatenhill between Lawns Farm Cottage and Tatenhill may	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		Policy	be of significant national historic interest and should be preserved in its own right. Please also see attached scan of report. See also TR003 John Fawn appendix1	
TR004	Environment Agency		<p><b>TATENHILL NEIGHBOURHOOD SUBMISSION</b></p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 19 August 2015 regarding the above Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Document July 2015.</p> <p>Having reviewed the document we have no objections as the proposed changes do not impact on our statutory remit.</p>	-
TR005	Paul and Petra Brown	SP2, SP3 and SP4	<p>SP4: Sustainability and Climate change, this should be adhered to and villagers desires adhered to, should be heard.</p> <p>SP3: The communities have submitted agreement for up to 25 infill homes in Tatenhill and Rangemore and no more. I/wish this to be adhered to.</p> <p>SP2: landscape features to be retained. This concerns me, as this goes without saying. The countryside is special and this implies that there are considerations that would destroy or put at risk these features. I/we wish this to be protected and preserved.</p>	Yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR006	Robert and Lesley Walker	Obj 2 Obj 4	<p>The village needs to retain its "village status and not simply become a suburb of Burton. Proposed developments at Lovers Farm and the proposed new academy at Yew's Bridge will significantly harm this. They will also serve to increase traffic flow through the village and appropriate measures are therefore required to restrict this.</p> <p>The retention of a green space between Tatenhill and "greater Burton" is vital.</p>	Yes
TR007	Geoff Alger	Keeping in the Local Green Spaces in and around the village, especially Branston Rd Tatenhill	<p>I WHOLLY SUPPORT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD plan, PARTICULARLY KEEPING LOCAL GREEN SPACES.</p>	Not stated
TR008	Pete Cooper	HE1-Parish	Tatenhill Parish Community Group has been involved in the Neighbourhood Plan process	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
	Tatenhill Parish Community Group	Housing Strategy HE2-Local Housing Needs HE4-Tatenhill Airfield LC2-Local Green Spaces IN2-Highway Safety	<p>from the beginning and support the <b>whole plan</b> as it now stands. Although the Examiner’s initial report did add to the plan in a number of ways, in some key areas it did not reflect the wishes of the community.</p> <p>The Group believe that the further changes agreed by Tatenhill Parish Council and East Staffordshire Borough Council, <b>highlighted in blue</b>, bring the Plan back in line with what the Community intended, whilst keeping it in compliance with national planning policy.</p> <p>Would particularly comment on:</p> <p>HE1-Parish Housing Strategy            HE2-Local Housing Needs            HE4-Tatenhill Airfield            LC2-Local Green Spaces            IN2-Highway Safety</p> <p><b>HE1-Parish Housing Strategy</b>            Agree with the term “approximately” to describe the desired number of houses.</p> <p><b>HE2-Local Housing Needs</b>            The Parish needs properties for the young and elderly and therefore support the policy including the amendment.</p> <p><b>HE4-Tatenhill Airfield</b>            Agree the Policy and supporting text</p> <p><b>LC2-Local Green Spaces</b>            Local green spaces are vital to a rural parish such as Tatenhill, particularly those which separate it from adjacent urban areas.</p> <p><b>IN2-Highway Safety</b>            This policy is one of the most important in the Plan and addresses a priority issue.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR009	William Tipper Rangemore Gardens	7. Recreation and Tourism Policies RT2 designated trails Appendix 3 TPNDP Proposals Map, Rangemore Inset map	<i>The Rangemore inset map show a proposed 'Designated Trail (RT2)'. The majority of the route suggested in the Proposal map is not a public right of way and is in private ownership. The suggested trail is therefore not achievable.</i>	
TR010	Carol Cooper	All of Plan, but particularly policies HE1, HE2, LC2.	HE1 & HE2 It is important that we have additional houses to keep our villages vibrant, however this growth should not be unlimited. Priority needs to be given to starter homes, homes for our older residents and some of these need to be affordable. The two policies together cover these points. LC2 This policy has been one of the most supported at the public meetings I have attended. We need preserved green spaces in our villages, but of equal importance is Branston Road Tatenhill, to keep the village from becoming a suburb of Burton.	yes
TR011	H J Bristow	Whole Plan	I am supporting all sections of the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Development Plan. I would like to give my support to the creation of the Local Green Spaces (LC2) particularly the	yes



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>land to the North and South of Branston Road to maintain a distinct gap between the proposed development at Lawns Farm and the village. Any development of this site will fundamentally change the local environment. At all the consultation sessions I attended this area was frequently discussed and everyone supported keeping this as a green space for the protection of our village.</p> <p>The section of the plan relating to traffic calming (IN2) is also a vital part of the Development Plan. Our villages are plagued by speeding traffic and lorries, some of which cross the canal bridge ignoring the weight restriction, the Parish Council's decision to include a section which will investigate solutions to these problems is an important part of the Plan.</p> <p>It is regrettable that the Inspector wished to amend the Housing Policy (HE1) changing the wording to a "minimum number" rather than a "maximum of" this did not truly reflect the wishes of the Parishioners. This is after all supposed to be <b>their</b> plan and to demand a change which does not reflect their wishes is not democratic and not in the spirit of Localism.</p>	
TR012	Helena Pointer Tatenhill Parish Council	I support all parts of the Neighbourhood Plan. In particular the revised Policies – HE1, HE2 and LC2.	HE1 to include the word "approximately" to the number of houses to be developed in the Parish as a whole, HE2 to include 30% affordable housing and LC2 to protect significant local green spaces, particularly land north of Branston Road, Tatenhill.	yes
TR013	David Pointer	HE1	HE1 Policy – I do not agree to the inclusion of the word 'approximately' when relating to	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		LC2	<p>the number of houses to be developed in the future as I feel there should be an upper limit in what is a fairly unspoiled rural community.</p> <p>LC2 – I particularly support the Neighbourhood’s plan to maintain a significant green space between the Lawns Farm development and the village of Tatenhill, in the area north of Branston Road.</p> <p>This area has been identified by the Staffordshire Local Authority as suitable for a proposed large Academy school.</p> <p>At the public meeting in the village on 16<sup>th</sup> September there was unanimous support to oppose this development, and Councillors present, and in particular the person responsible for education, conceded that at the time the Lawns Farm development was proposed, some 5 years ago, no thought was given to including such a provision within the Lawns Farm development, therefore suggesting that yet more green space be taken up to rectify what must be seen as a lack of foresight at that time.</p> <p>We have in the 20 years or so since moving to the area seen the expansion of the Berkeley Park Garden Centre, the development of 300 acres of green space for the ST. George’s Park development, Lawns Farm, and now a large school! I also understand there are moves afoot to also transfer Burton Rugby Club to an area opposite Lawns Farm! I was quoted in the Burton Mail the day after the public meeting that, because we are a small community, the powers that be think they can get away with this with minimal opposition.</p>	
TR014	Phil Metcalfe National Forest Company	LC3 and IN3	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Tatenhill Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The National Forest Company (NFC) supports the creation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) to ensure that development is plan-led and locally influenced. The NFC welcomes the support given to The National Forest throughout the document and the recognition that many of our aims and objectives mirror those contained within the NDP as stated in Policy LC3.</p>	Not stated

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>In particular, the NFC welcomes the encouragement within Strategic Policy 2 for further woodland planting to enhance and create views and for the existing wooded character of scattered trees, farmsteads and copses to be replicated in new design.</p> <p>The strong support for leisure and tourism development throughout the document is welcomed as this reflects our aspirations to promote the Forest as a sustainable tourism destination and increase use of existing Forest sites by visitors as well as residents. Objective 6 and Policy RT4 are therefore supported by the NFC.</p> <p>The NFC supports Policy RT1 concerning footpaths. The National Forest Way (<a href="http://www.nationalforestway.co.uk">www.nationalforestway.co.uk</a>), a promoted long distance footpath covering 75 miles of The National Forest, passes through the Parish including through Tatenhill and Rangemore along public rights of way. The enhancement of the existing footpath network will also improve the accessibility of existing National Forest woodlands within the Parish.</p> <p>Policy LC3 – The National Forest and Green and Blue Infrastructure is welcomed. This will sit well with the National Forest policy within the East Staffordshire Local Plan and ensure that new developments contribute to the creation of the Forest and connect existing green infrastructure features.</p> <p>Policy IN3 promotes public realm improvements within the villages, please bear in mind that we have grant funding available for tree planting within urban areas, such as for street trees within a public realm scheme, which may potentially be suitable for these works provided that the requirements are not required by a planning permission.</p> <p>The NFC would be grateful if the above comments could be taken into account when producing the next version of the plan and if we could be consulted on that, in due</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>course.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if any of the points raised require clarification or if you need anything further.</p>	
TR015	Clifford H & Muriel Pitchfork	We would make the following comments on the Tatenhill Parish Neighbourhood Plan as a whole., particularly Housing, Local Green Space and traffic.	<p>We have followed the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan closely, having attended several public meetings and taken every opportunity to make observations. Having lived in Tatenhill for over 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. We therefore welcome the Housing policies HE1 &amp; HE2</p> <p>Traffic has become a major problem within the village, made worse by developments such as St Georges Park, where Tatenhill is used as a regular through route, despite signing to the contrary. We strongly support policy IN2 on Highway safety.</p> <p>Finally, but of equal importance is policy LC2 on Local Green Spaces. We need this to apply to the land to both the North and South of Branston Road Tatenhill, if the village is not to become an extension of the proposed Lawns Farm development.</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR016	Mr and Mrs Westlake	HE1, HE2, LC2, IN2	<p>WE WELCOME THE CHANGES &amp; CLARIFICATIONS OF THESE AREAS OF THE PLAN.</p> <p><u>LC2</u>  IN PARTICULAR WE WISH TO EMPHASISE THE IMPORTANCES OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES WHICH ARE DESIGNATED TO PROTECT THE RURAL IDENTITY OF OUR 2 VILLAGES.</p> <p>ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT TO US IS THE RETENTION OF THE AGRICULTURAL LAND EITHER SIDE OF BRANSTON ROAD - THIS PROMOTE A GREEN BUFFER ZONE BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF PATENHILL AND THE LAWN'S FARM/BRANSTON LOCKS DEVELOPMENT; PREVENTING THE VILLAGE FROM MERGING WITH THE URBAN FOOTPRINT OF BURTON-ON-TRENT</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR017	Antonoulla Easter	I refer to the NP as recommended and agreed by ESBC and Tatenhill PC in response to the independent examiners recommendations	<p>I support all of the revised plans as shown in the "blue text" as agreed by ESBC and T. PC. and contrary to the Independent examiners recommendations</p> <p>I support the protection of green local spaces, especially the land to the north of Bantop Lane (the proposed secondary school site). I think it essential that it remains as a green gap between Bantop and Tatenhill Village. and that the beautiful view from the road of this part of the escarpment is not lost.</p>	Yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR018	Rodney Easter	I refer to the re-submitted NP as supported by ESBC in all aspects. I support all the text modified in blue in the document referring to changes agreed by ESBC and Tatenhill PC and contrary to the independent examiners recommendations.	<p><i>I am strongly in support of LC2 policy to protect significant green local spaces, particularly land north of Branston Road Tatenhill. (The proposed school site). I feel the view of Battlestead Hill from this road is a priceless asset which should be retained for the generations of Burton people to follow u.s.</i></p> <p><i>* If of interest, I have photographic evidence of this site in flood in late December 2012.</i></p>	yes
TR019	Kay Lear on behalf of Branston Parish Council	LC1 and LC2	<p>Thank you for allowing Branston parish council to make representation to the Tatenhill Draft Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The parish council do have concerns regarding policies LC1 and LC2.</p>	Not stated

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>The ESBC local plan has evidenced that a number of additional school sites are required; a number of sites have been identified in both Branston and Tatenhill.</p> <p>Policies LC1 and LC2 appear to be designed to stop these.</p> <p>As development is primarily on the western side of Burton additional schools will be required. It is essential that both parish councils support future educational needs.</p>	
TR020	James Chadwick on behalf of Staffordshire County Council	Policy LC2 – Local Green Spaces	<p>We object to this Policy insofar as it relates to Land North of Branston Road in Tatenhill (herein referred to as 'the land') and the delivery of strategic education infrastructure. In this context we do not believe it meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets the criteria for the designation of Local Green Spaces and paragraph 007 of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states '<i>Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.</i>' It is our contention that the allocation of the field to the north of Branston Road does not meet the requirements of paragraph 77 of the NPPF, is not in accordance with the guidance set out in the NPPG and as stated in said guidance is a 'back door'<sup>1</sup> way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name. This position is justified in detail below and we will further set out how we believe the overarching objective of LC2 can be achieved in tandem with the delivery of the required education infrastructure.</p> <p>It has been established through the Local Plan for East Staffordshire that a new secondary school will be required in Burton and that this will need to be located to the west of the town. Local Plan examination library document D.34 identifies possible sites for a new secondary school and identifies Land to the North of Branston Road as one of</p>	yes



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>the five shortlisted sites. In May of this year (2015) the County Council announced it had secured an option on the land and is currently progressing planning application for a new secondary school with a view to submission before the end of the year.</p> <p>Policy LC2 seeks to protect the local green spaces from development and makes reference to paragraph 89 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) in decision making. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF sets criteria for Local Planning Authorities considering development in the <u>Green Belt</u> and states that the local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in <u>Green Belt</u> with a few specific exceptions. Clearly the development of the site for a school is would conflict with such a policy where it relates to the development of the land.</p> <p>The land in question sits outside the settlement boundary and therefore is already afforded protection against inappropriate development through Policy SP8 of the emerging local plan. As such it is suggested that the further protection akin to green belt is unjustified.</p> <p>The Plan sets out at Appendix 4 justification for compliance with criteria set out in NPPF paragraph 77. Whilst it is appreciated there is an element of judgement and subjectivity to the interpretation of NPPF paragraph 77 as it sets out in the first sentence of paragraph 77 that '<i>Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for <u>most</u> green areas or open space</i>' it is implied that such designations should therefore only be used sparingly and where the three criteria are clearly met. It is not contested that the land is in close proximity to the community it serves so the first of the three criteria is met. However, in relation to criteria two and three we do not believe it has been clearly demonstrated that the land in question is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance; is local in character; and is not an extensive tract of land. In the justification for the designation the main thrust of the argument put forward is to maintain a green buffer between the village and the Branston Locks SUE i.e. to prevent coalescence. It has not been demonstrated that this can only be achieved through designation of the whole the land in its current size and shape. Furthermore, as the land is currently cropped with no public access it is contended that there is no</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>additional justification to support its local significance other than the gap it creates between the village and the Branston Locks SUE.</p> <p>With regards to the third criterion whether the designation is an extensive tract of land the plan seeks to justify the size of the proposed designation by application of dictionary definitions of extensive and limited. Whilst there is no clear guide in the NPPF or NPPG as to a minimum or maximum acreage for a local green space designation it is clear that the land in question is a large parcel of land at 9.2 hectares. When considered against the rationale behind the proposed designation it could be argued that the land is excessive for the purpose and therefore could be seen to be construed as an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Whilst we are of the opinion that the proposed local green space does not accord with National Policy we do acknowledge the County Council does have a vested interest in the land for the provision of a new secondary school to meet the requirements for Burton. When considered against the Neighbourhood Plans' rationale for putting forward the land for designation we believe that the school proposal will deliver a similar outcome as the local green space designation in maintaining a green separation between the village and Branston Locks. Whilst the school site will encompass the whole of the land subject to the proposed designation built form and hardstanding will only take up around 15-25% of the total site area, the remaining 75-85% will be made up of school playing fields, landscaping and habitat areas. This ratio is in accordance with Department for Education National standards set out in Building Bulletin 103 - Area guidelines for mainstream schools, June2014 (An indicative plan is appended to aid interpretation). Therefore, there will be considerable open/green space within the development of the school site. The school building could be positioned within the site such as to maximise the 'green gap' between the village and the Branston Locks SUE created by the playing field.</p> <p>The proposed school is scheduled to open in September 2018. It will therefore take at least five years to fill, which is over half way through the plan period. Once the school is fully established it will be sustained long after this plan period therefore the 'green gap' will be maintained for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, the playing fields will be</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>afforded protection against further development through National Planning Policy and additionally via Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and/or Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010, which require the Secretary of State's consent for change of use or disposal of playing field land associated with a school. As such the school proposal will offer the same if not a greater level of protection of the 'green gap' than the local green space designation.</p> <p>In addition the proposal for the school will result in a potential for community use of the playing fields, which will be an added benefit over that of the Local Green Space designation alone as the land currently is in agricultural use with no public access. Furthermore, through careful design of the landscape and habitat areas it may be possible to create the link to the community woodland and Battlestead hill that the Neighbourhood Plan sets out as an aspiration.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Tatenhill Inset Map that identifies the Local Green Spaces cuts off the Land to the North of Branston Road and as such is not an accurate representation of what is actually to be covered by the suggested Policy.</p> <p>In relation to the East Staffordshire Local Plan that is currently at examination and awaiting the inspectors report it is noted that there are policies contained therein related to development outside of settlement boundaries and to strategic green gaps. It is therefore put forward that there is within the strategic plan sufficient policy coverage in this area.</p> <p>To conclude we suggest that the policy as drafted should be amended to either remove the land that is the subject of the school proposal or include a further exception that allows in principle the development of the land for education purposes.</p> <p>Ideally we would have liked to have seen the Neighbourhood Plan support the school proposal and help shape the development through appropriate policy. However, at this stage in the plan process that opportunity may have passed by. Nevertheless, we shall continue to engage with the Parish Council in shaping the application for the school. If it would assist the examiner we would be prepared to attend a hearing session on this</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>matter to clarify any points.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 37-015-20140306</p> <p>See also document: TR020 Staffs CC appendix1</p>	
TR021	Robert Burstow	Policy HE1: Housing	<p>I support this part of the revised Plan, as amended by TPC. It seems reasonable and proportionate that the number of new dwellings to be built in the Parish should be limited to approximately 25 within the identified period, and that this figure is not treated as a minimum, with no upper limit. As Tatenhill, Tatenhill Common and Rangemore are small settlements, an increase in their size beyond this would risk permanently altering and spoiling their attractive and distinctive character, and diluting the sense of community existing in each place and collectively within the Parish. The proposals also seem well considered in relation to the different types of homes envisaged.</p>	yes
TR022	Robert Burstow	Policy IN2: Highway Safety	<p>I support this part of the revised Plan, as amended by TPC. It is vital that Highway Safety forms part of the Plan. In a parish where roads and lanes are narrow and often without footpaths, the quantity of passing and parked traffic must be carefully planned. In addition to the normal traffic volume passing through the parish, regular accidents and delays on the busy A38 means that speeding traffic often diverts through the parish. I would argue that roads and lanes should not be changed very much, as their narrow width and uneven surfaces already serve to slow traffic. There is a risk that 'traffic calming' measures – more road markings and better illumination - might increase the speed of traffic. I suggest that curbs are made higher, speed is limited to 20mph in built-up areas, and limits are placed on the size of non-essential vehicles using the roads (ie, excluding agricultural or delivery vehicles) and that future building developments in and</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			around the Parish are carefully planned to ensure there is not a large increase in the volume of moving traffic or parked vehicles. Given the forthcoming development on Lawns Farm land, I would like to see a footpath constructed on one side of Branston Lane from the Tatenhill crossroads to the proposed development to encourage people to walk rather than drive.	
TR023	Robert Burstow	Policy LC2: protection of Local Green Spaces	I strongly support this part of the revised Plan, as amended by TPC. The designated Local Green Spaces in the parish are vital to the identity and integrity of the settlements. They perform several important functions – ecological (sustaining bio-diversity), health and recreational (encouraging walking, cycling and children’s play) and aesthetic/psychological wellbeing (providing contrast to the built environment and distant views). These factors will become increasingly important to residents and visitors as time passes. At Tatenhill, they especially help preserve the distinctive and attractive character of the village’s placing in the landscape of the National Forest, recognised as a Conservation Area. The field to the north of Branston Lane, at the foot of Battlestead Hill, will provide a crucial buffer for the village when the nearby Lawn Farms land is developed and may additionally serve a cultural function in the future, as it has been suggested that it may have historical significance for the nation as the site of the battle that led to the formation of the Kingdom of England (archaeological investigations of the site may be called for in the future).	
TR024	Benjamin Walker	Policy Support: In general terms, I support the principles employed by the	The number of housing should be controlled with particular consideration for the young and elderly. Local green spaces should be preserved to enhance/maintain the village’s autonomy, in particular the village’s iconic entrance from Branston Road should not be developed when other options for the proposed secondary school are both available and substantially better. The proposed traffic volume and speed reduction is paramount. This is especially relevant to Tatenhill Common where speeds in excess of 70Mph have become	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		parish council in the development of the neighbourhood plan	commonplace with the risk of a tragedy intolerable. A sad indictment of the stimulus needed for change.	
TR025	CP Walker	Policy Support: In general terms, I support the principles employed by the parish council in the development of the neighbourhood plan	<p>The number of housing should be controlled with particular consideration for the young and elderly.</p> <p>Local green spaces should be preserved to enhance/maintain the village's autonomy, in particularly the village's iconic entrance from Branston Road should not be developed when other options for the proposed secondary school are both available and substantially better.</p> <p>The proposed traffic volume and speed reduction is paramount. This is especially relevant to Tatenhill Common where speeds in excess of 70Mph have become commonplace with the risk of a tragedy intolerable. A sad indictment of the stimulus needed for change.</p>	yes
TR026	Pauline Walker	Policy Support: In general terms, I support the	<p>The number of housing should be controlled with particular consideration for the young and elderly.</p> <p>Local green spaces should be preserved to enhance/maintain the village's autonomy, in particularly the village's iconic entrance from Branston Road should not be developed when other options for the proposed secondary school are both available and</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		principles employed by the parish council in the development of the neighbourhood plan	substantially better. The proposed traffic volume and speed reduction is paramount. This is especially relevant to Tatenhill Common where speeds in excess of 70Mph have become commonplace with the risk of a tragedy intolerable. A sad indictment of the stimulus needed for change.	
TR027	Peter Leaver of JLL On behalf of Nurton Developments (Quintus) Ltd	Proposals Map and Policy LC1	<p>The Proposals Map (Tatenhill Inset Map) has designated a key view on the top of Battlestead Hill that lies <b>outside</b> the NDP boundary and outside the Parish Boundary. For ease of reference, we have highlighted this view in yellow on the attached marked version of the Policies Map (Tatenhill Inset).</p> <p>Battlestead Hill is situated within the neighbouring Branston Parish which has its own adopted NP.</p> <p>As the key view refers directly to a policy (LC1 – Key Views), and concerns views of land that fall also outside the NP Area, we consider that this designation goes beyond the scope of the NP and, therefore, fails basic conditions. We note that all the other key view designations on the original Proposals Map outside the NP Area have been removed. We note also that Policy LC1 has not been amended on the basis of the Inspector’s recommendations, with no changes proposed. The Inspector considered that the then proposed wording did not meet basic conditions.</p> <p>Please also see: TR027 JLL on behalf of Nurton appendix1</p>	yes
TR028	Elizabeth Martin - Parish Clerk Tatenhill Parish Council	The policies that we would particularly	The Parish Council has been working closely with the community for over three years to develop the Neighbourhood Plan and has become very aware of what the vast majority of residents would like to see it achieve. From the beginning we set out to allow the villages to grow to ensure their communities are sustainable, but also to protect what	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		<p>comment on therefore are:</p> <p>HE1-Parish Housing Strategy</p> <p>HE2-Local Housing Needs</p> <p>HE4-Tatenhill Airfield</p> <p>LC2-Local Green Spaces</p> <p>IN2-Highway Safety</p>	<p>people like about the area.</p> <p>At the first examination, a number of changes were recommended to ensure the Plan was in compliance with National Planning Policy and the existing East Staffordshire Local Plan. The Majority of these were readily accepted as improving the Plan, however 5 policies would have been omitted or changed to such an extent that the Plan would have not been acceptable to the community.</p> <p>With the advice and guidance of East Staffordshire Borough Council, the 5 policies were changed further, and like the principal authority, we believe that we now have a Plan which is compliant and which the Parish Council can recommend to the community.</p> <p><u>HE1-Parish Housing Strategy</u> The Council accept that it is not possible to set an absolute maximum number of new dwellings, but support the revised wording set out in blue, which does give strong guidance but allows flexibility.</p> <p><u>HE2-Local Housing Needs</u> It is a vital element of the Plan that homes are provided to meet need, particularly for young persons and for our elderly residents who choose to remain in the Parish. It is imperative that affordable housing is achievable within our villages.</p> <p><u>HE4-Tatenhill Airfield</u> The Council has always supported acceptable growth at the Airfield and believe that the revised policy makes this clear without being over restrictive.</p> <p><u>LC2-Local Green Spaces</u> This has probably been the most popular policy at public meetings. Keeping Tatenhill separate from the expanding Burton on Trent is seen as the most important part of the</p>	



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Plan. At a public meeting held in Tatenhill on 16th September 2015, attended by over 60 people, it was unanimous that people wanted the key local green space on Branston Road, Tatenhill.</p> <p><u>IN2-Highway Safety</u> After local green space, this is the issue of most concern to residents. It is accepted that not all of the problems can be solved through planning however this policy makes a firm commitment to use planning tools whenever possible.</p>	
TR029	Angharad Davies	Whole document	I grew up in Tatenhill and my Mother still lives in the village, We would like to express our support for the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Development Plan, particularly the wish to create a Local Green Space to maintain the integrity of the village. The plans to help reduce the speed and volume of traffic and the use of the narrow lanes by large HGV vehicles is also supported. My Mother walks these village lanes regularly and has had many very close calls with speeding traffic.	Not stated
TR030	Edward Sloane		I refer to the re-submitted Neighbourhood Plan which I support in all aspects. I fully support the amendments identified in blue text agreed by ESBC and the Parish which are contrary to the independent examiners recommendations ie revised HE1, HE2 and LC2 policies.	No

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<i>(Make comment if you wish on your views to keep Land North of Bronston Road as a green gap between BOT &amp; Talehill</i>	
TR031	Olivia Stone	Whole Doc	I refer to the re-submitted Neighbourhood Plan which I support in all aspects. I fully supported the amendments highlighted in blue text agreed by the ESBC and the parish which are contrary to the independent examiners recommendations and revised HE1, HE2 and LC2 policies.	No

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR032	Berian Griffiths	HE1, HE2, LC2	<p>Policy HE1 - It is vital that the scale of any development is proportionate and the word 'approximate' should be entered with reference to the number of houses</p> <p>The retention of the elderly within the community and the accommodation of young people are vital to the character of the village and should be encouraged by requiring 30% affordable housing within Policy HE2</p> <p>Tatenhill's rural character is threatened by the loss of Local Green Space – especially along Branston Road -</p> <p>Policy LC2 needs to specifically address this issue and permanently secure the character of the community.</p> <p>Volumes of Traffic travelling through the narrow, winding village roads are increasing – there is an increase in bus and truck traffic and speeding is often an issue. The Neighbourhood plan needs to address these issues with specific proposals to conserve the quiet nature of the village and ensure the safety of local traffic and pedestrians.</p>	Yes
TR033	Julie Griffiths	HE1, HE2, LC2		Yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Policy HE1 needs to include the word 'approximately' when referring to the number of houses to ensure that development is proportionate to scale</p> <p>Policy HE2 should include 30% affordable housing to facilitate the retention of the elderly and youth within the village</p> <p>Policy LC2 needs to specifically address the maintenance of Local Green Space in particular along Branston Road Tatenhill to preserve the character of the community</p> <p>The Neighbourhood plan needs to address the issues of increased traffic through the narrow roads in the village and take measures to combat increased traffic speeds.</p>	
TR034	Sandra Dobson	Full Support Tatenhill parish Plan	Need to ensure that we keep a protected green spaces within the conservation areas and on Branston Road Tatenhill i.e. a buffer zone between battlestead escarpment and lawns farm development. Traffic volume reduction and speed reduction	yes
TR035	Paul Dobson	Fully support Tatenhill Parish Plan	Need to ensure that we keep protected green spaces within conservation areas and on Branston Road Tatenhill i.e. a buffer zone between battlestead escarpment and lawns farm development. Traffic volume reduction and speed reduction.	yes
TR036	Mrs Ann Parker		I support the Neighbourhood Plan especially concerns about the traffic and the Green Space to separate Tatenhill from Burton on Trent. I support the houses for	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			the elderly in the parish.	
TR037	Antony Muller Natural England	HE1	<p>Natural England refers the parish to our previous consultation responses (attached as separate PDF documents for ease of reference). We have considered the distance between the parish and the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and have no objections to the amended policy. In order to offer you the most up to date explanatory information we set out the following update on the Cannock Chase SAC partnership project, for reference:</p> <p>The emerging East Staffordshire local plan 'Detailed Policy 11 European sites' refers. With specific regard to Cannock Chase SAC the Borough Council's representative on the SAC Partnership is Naomi Perry.</p> <p>Although East Staffordshire Borough Council has not yet decided on whether to publish guidance for developers regarding the SAC and associated mitigation measures you may wish to refer to the following Lichfield District Council document setting out the revised mitigation regime in respect of new housing in the project area (Lichfield DC is a partner in the project)</p> <p>'Revised guidance on Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and associated mitigation measures for residential development'. Weblink here: <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/download/1801/ldc_ccsac_guidance_march_2015">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/download/1801/ldc_ccsac_guidance_march_2015</a></p> <p><b>Please also see appendices: TR037 Natural England appendix1 and TR037 Natural England appendix2</b></p>	yes
TR038	William Marshall	HE1, HE2, LC2	Acceptable including agreed amendments. LC2: The designated open green	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			spaces are a vital part of the neighbourhood plan and should not be available for any development.	
TR039	Matthew Marshall	HE1, HE2, LC2	<p><u>HE1</u> - I endorse the amendments which clearly acknowledge the need for growth and will ensure that any development is not detrimental to the environment, rural character and appeal of the parish. The spatial strategy will fairly distribute new housing to meet requirements across the parish, benefit the community and minimise the negative impacts on individual areas.</p> <p><u>HE2</u> - The amendment ensures a fair proportion of affordable houses in any new development to meet the diverse needs of the community.</p> <p><u>LC2</u> - I agree with the areas identified as designated green spaces which are special to the community, in close proximity to the community and are not extensive tracts of land. Moreover, the land to the south of Braunston Rd is categorised as Category 3 flood risk and the land opposite, to the north of Braunston Rd, must be preserved as it will act as a critical buffer zone against the exacerbated flooding risk arising from a major development on adjacent land (already categorised as Flood Risk Zone 3). All the green spaces identified also act as valuable ecological resources which enhance and maintain the character of the parish.</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			I support the plan in its entirety and endorse the amendments to sections HE1, HE2 and LC2, as agreed by ESBC and the Parish.	
TR040	Margaret Marshall	HE1, HE2, LC2	I support the plan in its entirety including the amendments to sections HE1, HE2 and LC2, as agreed by ESBC and the Parish.	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p><u>HE1.</u> I agree with the amendments which clearly acknowledge the need for growth but will ensure that any development is not detrimental to the environment, rural character and appeal of the Parish. The spatial strategy will fairly distribute new housing to meet anticipated requirements across the Parish benefit the community and minimise the negative impact on individual areas.</p> <p><u>HE2.</u> The amendment ensures a fair proportion of affordable houses in any new development to meet the diverse needs of the community</p> <p><u>LC2.</u> I agree with the identified areas which are within close proximity to the community, special to that community and not extensive tracts of land. Moreover, the land to the south of Branston Road is categorised a level 3 flood risk and the land opposite, north of Branston Road would act as a critical buffer zone to mitigate the exacerbated flood risk on adjacent land (already category 2 and 3) from a major development. All these areas are valuable ecological resources which enhance and maintain the character of the Parish.</p>	
TR041	Jonathan Harbottle Providence Land	LC2 – Protected Green Space - Land North of Branston Road		yes



Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>The inclusion of this site as Local Green Space does not meet the required Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans, in respect of having regard to national policy and guidance from Secretary of State.</p> <p>With regard to the NPPF paragraph 77, the proposal does meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Space as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) it is not in close proximity to most of the Tatenhill community;</li> <li>b) it has not been demonstrated to be of sufficient importance to the local community as Local Green Space; and</li> <li>c) at more than 9ha is clearly an extensive tract of land.</li> </ul> <p>As such, the proposal should not be designated as Local Green Space by Policy LC2.</p> <p>The Examiner has already proposed the former policy for deletion because it did not meet the Basic Conditions. The re-naming of the policy does not alter the fundamental flaw in the proposal, in that the expressed wish it to visually protect a large tract of open countryside between Tatenhill and Burton upon Trent, in the manner of a Green Gap. However, as this affects the development potential of the main town of the District, it is clearly a strategic matter for the Local Plan, which is not seeking to designate the land for this purpose.</p> <p>Other land around Burton in this vicinity is protected as Strategic Green Gap as shown on the proposed policies map, therefore the issue of visual separation between the two settlements has already been considered and addressed. The Strategic Green Gaps Topic Paper explains that the proposed Strategic Green Gap (which excludes the land north of Branston Road) would be able to prevent development coalescing between Burton upon Trent and Tatenhill, protect the character and setting of the village of Tatenhill and allow some growth to be delivered for both settlements.</p> <p>Regard should also be had to the reference in the NPPG Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 37-015-20140306 that states blanket designation for Local Green Space of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Moreover, the justification in Appendix 4 of the amended Neighbourhood Plan does not convince as to why the land is of special Local Green Space value, particularly as any visual role as setting for the Conservation Area already has adequate statutory and local policy recognition. And as the land comprises a standard arable field with hedgerow around the edge and no existing recreational function or special biodiversity provision, so it falls short of providing multi-functional green spaces that could be categorised as green infrastructure. Nor is the site in easy walking distance, or visible from, the the majority of the village.</p> <p>A key problem is also that the site has been identified by the County Council as the most suitable site for a Secondary School of around 1800 pupils serving Burton upon Trent and surrounds.</p> <p>A Strategic Objective of the examined Local Plan (SO5: Education Infrastructure) is to plan for and deliver new education infrastructure to meet the growing need of Borough residents, particularly in Burton upon Trent where school place demand exceeds supply irrespective of further growth. Strategic Policy 10 (as modified) states that the Council will work in partnership with Staffordshire County Council and Academies to bring forward additional new schools.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.84 of the examined Local Plan (as modified) states (our emphasis) that the Borough Council have been working with Staffordshire County Council since 2011 and will continue to work in partnership to ensure education infrastructure is delivered over the plan period in line with need arising, either predicted or unpredicted. <b>Evidence prepared shows that a secondary school will be required on the west of Burton upon Trent.</b></p> <p>Given the significant amount of preparatory work on this project, the Examiner is respectfully requested to arrange a Hearing session to address the serious educational implications of designating this site for Local Green Space, if it is considered there is any merit in this proposed designation.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
TR042	Paula Tolley		We need to ensure footpaths are extended by side of roads and green spaces are maintained.	Yes
TR043	Mary Green	HE1, HE2, LC2	<p>I support the plan in its entirety, including the amendments to sections HE1, HE2 and LC2, as agreed by ESBC and the Parish.</p> <p>HE1 - I agree with the amendments. They clearly acknowledge the need for growth but will ensure that the environment, rural character and attraction of the Parish is preserved through development. The special strategy will distribute new housing fairly to meet the requirement which are anticipated across the parish. HE2 - The amendment ensures a fair proportion of affordable houses in any new development to meet the community's diverse needs. LC2 - I agree with the identified areas which are within close proximity to the community, special to its residents and not extensive. The land to the south of Branston Road is categorised as a level 3 flood risk and the land to the north of Branston Road represents a critical buffer zone to mitigate the increased flood risk on adjacent land</p>	No

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			(already category 2 and 3) caused by major development. All these areas are vital ecological resources which enhance and maintain the character of the Parish.	