

Denstone Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Tuesday 23rd August – Wednesday 5th October 2016

Regulation 16 representations

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
DEN01	Sport England	Whole document	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above Neighbourhood Consultation.</p> <p>Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important.</p> <p>It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement’.</p> <p>http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and</p>	No

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>further information can be found following the link below: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</p> <p>Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/</p> <p>If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>If you need any further advice please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.</p>	
DEN02	Highways England	–	Highways England welcome sight of your latest submission of the Denstone Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16). Highways England have no comment to make	no
DEN03	Historic England	Whole document	DENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN- SUBMISSION DRAFT Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Denstone Neighbourhood Plan.	yes

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>As stated in our consultation response to the Regulation 14 Plan. Historic England is entirely supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it and we particularly commend the use of historic characterization to provide a context and a sound evidence base for well thought out Plan policies.</p> <p>In this and other respects Historic England considers that the Plan takes an exemplary approach to the historic environment. All those who have clearly worked extremely hard in drafting the Plan are to be congratulated on the end product.</p> <p>Overall Historic England considers that the Denstone Draft Neighbourhood Plan is a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document that exemplifies “constructive conservation” and constitutes a very good example of community led planning.</p>	
DEN04	Flood Risk Management, Staffs County Council	Specifically DP2	<p>As per our allocation representations during the formation of the Denstone NP, we have no other site specific comments to make.</p> <p>We would reiterate that in terms of ‘<i>Development Principles Policy DP2’ Infrastructure: Flooding & Drainage (objective 1)</i> that the aims within the policy should be in accordance with National and Local Policy.</p>	yes
DEN05	East Staffordshire Borough Council	Whole plan	<p>DP1 – Our Development Control team has commented that bullet 4, the provision of superfast broadband could be onerous; although there are caveats in the policy should it not be feasible. In part B some clarification would be useful on point 2: how far should a development have regard to views, streetscene? Wider views?</p> <p>DP2 – no further comment</p> <p>SB1 – this Policy allocates 3 main sites for housing development, to meet the Local Plan (2012-2031) Development Requirement of a minimum of 20 dwellings. The Policy does not give a maximum number of houses, but says “around 20” (therefore in our opinion meeting the basic conditions). The</p>	yes

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Settlement Boundary extensions are minimal to just accommodate a net quantum of 16 dwellings, taking into consideration some permissions granted since 2012.</p> <p>SB1(A) – A definition of a ‘small’ 3 bed dwelling would be useful. Would it not be better to have a mix of houses on this site, to meet the requirement in Policy H2.</p> <p>ESBC still has concerns over putting the whole of the Vinewood farm site within the new Settlement Boundary (SB1C) as the farmstead would then have a presumption in favour of development. Also, when assessed by the NP group the north of Vinewood Road site resulted in 7 reds and was deemed unsuitable for development. It is not immediately obvious why this site was then put in the plan. Also, in 2014 an application for one dwelling was refused on the north of Vinewood farm (P/2014/00338). The refusal was based on the fact it lay outside the existing Settlement Boundary but also had objections from Highways because of the probable highway safety issues/visibility splay issues with the access. This may be mitigated by specifically detailing that the access to the northern part of the site should not have an adverse impact on the safe and efficient use of the Highway Network.</p> <p>SB1(C) – final paragraph. ESBC would use Local Plan SP24 and the design guide with self-builds.</p> <p>SB1 justification: Phasing. Is the phasing information direct from landowners? This information should possibly be deleted as the delivery of the sites would be led by developers/landowners. Without a policy mechanism phasing is in the control of landowners/developers.</p> <p>Policy SB2 – this Policy is nearly identical to Policy H2 in the Yoxall NP. This is a very strict inside/outside SB policy and Yoxall Parish Council have in actual fact supported some small schemes adjacent to their Settlement boundary which ESBC have refused because of H2.</p> <p>Is it just small scale proposals or all developments outside the settlement boundary that this policy is controlling? Would it be better to say “Proposals</p>	

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>for small scale new housing ..." as bullet point a mentions small sites – a definition of what is classed as ‘small’ would be helpful for decision makers.</p> <p>Policy AB1 – no comment</p> <p>Policy AB2 – no further comment</p> <p>Policy H1 – The phrase “visual intrusion” is a broad term and would be difficult to decide on.</p> <p>Policy H2 – In practice this policy may contradict Policy SB1 – is it supposed to be for sites other than those identified in SB1? For example SB1(A) states the site is for 6, 3 bed dwellings so would not meet the housing mix in H2. Last sentence Building Regulation should be Part M4(2).</p> <p>Policy H3 – no further comment</p> <p>Policy BE1 – Insert “in” between “identified” and “the” in first sentence. Development Control have commented that requiring both a design and Access Statement and heritage Statement for every development could be onerous. Sometimes they may conflict with each other and both would not be required.</p> <p>Policy BE2 – no further comment</p> <p>Policy BE3 – This is quite onerous if EVERY development has to demonstrate they have taken into account the impact above and below ground ref archaeology. A ‘where feasible’ or ‘in the vicinity of known deposits’ or similar would make this less onerous (although we recognise HE are very much in favour of this policy).</p> <p>Policy NE1 – As above the production of a freestanding report or inclusion of landscape factors in a D and A statement could be seen as onerous for small/householder developments which require planning permission. Currently some small developments don’t even need a D and A Statement.</p> <p>NE2 – no comment</p> <p>T1 – no comment</p> <p>Policy CFOS1 – no comment</p> <p>Policy CFOS2 – For clarity we would recommend deleting the start of the third paragraph, as this is covered in the next Policy. Delete “In addition to those</p>	

Rep No	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>areas proposed as Local Green Spaces under Policy CFOS3,...”</p> <p>Bullet point D is not defined by a border, unlike the others in the list.</p> <p>Bullet point E – is this the same as LGS A in Policy CFOS3? If so it would be better protected in CFOS3, so should be deleted from CFOS2.</p> <p>Policy CFOS3 – designating a Local Green Space can only be made using NPPF paras 76 and 77. We suggest the wording of the policy is made more clear and concise, along the lines of:</p> <p>“Each of the areas listed below and shown on the proposals map are designated as Local Green Space where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances.”</p> <p>Consider deleting the phrase “Designation of” out of the title of this policy.</p> <p>Policies LE1, RE1 and RE2 – no comment.</p>	
DEN06	Natural England	Whole document	<p>Natural England does not consider that this application poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment¹ for which we would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.</p>	no