

## STRETTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Paragraph 13 of Schedule 4B: Consultation Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> August 2015 to Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2015

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
SR001	East Staffordshire Borough Council	All	<p><u>Introductory Statement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Stretton Neighbourhood Plan was originally submitted to East Staffordshire Borough Council (under Regulation 16) and consultation took place between 8<sup>th</sup> December 2014 and 26<sup>th</sup> January 2015. It was subsequently examined by Alyson Linnegar in February /March 2015. The Examiner, in her Report, made recommendations for changes which she 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 Conditions,</li> </ol>	-

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>and is happy for the Plan to be submitted for re-examination.</p> <p>5. ESBC recognises that this course of action is unprecedented. In accordance with Counsel’s advice, the Council approached the Examiner of the original Plan, Alyson Linnegar, to examine the re-submitted Plan. Unfortunately, she felt unable to do so, and instead, the Council canvassed three examiners who had examined Neighbourhood Plans in East Staffordshire before. As a result, the Council appointed Dr Angus Kennedy to examine the re-submitted Plan.</p> <p>6. ESBC 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>7. Policy S1 – The policy has now achieved a good balance between being positively worded whilst also expressing the local community’s concerns over the coalescence of Stretton with Rolleston on Dove and the need to protect land that creates the setting for Stretton, contributes to local people’s wellbeing and, in the north and east, is part of a landscape with historic landscape significance.</p> <p>8. Policy S5 – The Council’s Conservation Officer suggests adding something to this policy on the lines of consolidating existing signage in order to reduce visual clutter.</p> <p>9. Policy S8 – The Policy on Local Heritage Assets, where works require permission, has been totally re-worded, with a third paragraph which is now more flexible, in that it accepts loss of such assets where there is a public benefit which outweighs the loss. The Council’s Conservation Officer suggests rewording the final paragraph so that it says something like, “...such proposals will only be permitted should significant/substantial public benefit resulting from the proposal be demonstrated which would outweigh the loss or harm...”</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>10. Policy S11 – The Examiner of the original Plan sought the total deletion of this Policy (which was at that time numbered S12). ESBC, the Parish Council and their consultants have discussed each of the sites originally listed in the old S12. Many of the sites were in Parish Council or ESBC ownership, and did not require Local Green Space protection, as open space policies within the Local Plan would provide this. Other privately owned sites, including recreational facilities and the churchyard would also be protected by the Local Plan or by national legislation. The Priory Centre’s protection was removed to Policy S9, so that S11 could be concerned just with sports and recreation facilities and open space. The new policy now sets out all the spaces that are special to the community, protecting them in line with the NPPF, but also allowing flexibility, particularly with regard to school provision.</p> <p>11. The Parish Council have decided to remove references to Local Green Spaces in S11. As a matter of information, it should be noted, however, that sites 4 and 5 (Station Walk/Jinny Nature Trail) form a part of the Jinny Trail which continues northwards into Rolleston on Dove Parish. In the Examiner’s Report for the Neighbourhood Plan for this Parish, he agreed to the designation as a Local Green Space of that part of the Trail in Rolleston Parish. However, this Neighbourhood Plan has not progressed any further towards Referendum yet. Whilst the Stretton Plan should recognise the importance of the Trail, and that it crosses two Neighbourhood Plan areas, ESBC does not consider that LGS designation is essential. After all, the Stretton part of the Trail is owned by the Parish Council, and the Rolleston section is owned by Rolleston Parish Council.</p> <p>12. Policy S13 – This policy (formerly S14) has been re-written and it is now clear that the subject is supporting the local economy, rather than dealing specifically with leisure and cafes and restaurants.</p> <p>13. The change to Policy S14 (formerly S16) was suggested by ESBC and has been agreed by Parish Council. It is based on wording approved by the Examiner of the Yoxall</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>Neighbourhood Plan, which has passed Referendum and has now been made by ESBC.</p> <p>14. Appendix III - the list of draft Local Plan policies should be deleted as the wording is not up to date, and the final wording will be determined following receipt of the Inspector's Report</p>	
SR002	Emma Lewsley	5.0 Vision and Para 6.1.4 and 6.1.3	<p>I agree that Stretton needs a unique and strong identity as we are at risk of being joined to our neighbours e.g. Rolleston, and no longer being seen as our own unique and separate place in Burton.</p> <p>I support 6.1.4. I also agree with 6.1.3 that development on open spaces/green fields should be strongly resisted as this protects our borders and keeps us from becoming just one big housing estate.</p>	yes
SR003	Brian Hallam	Housing development	It is ridiculous to consider any further housing development without the proper infrastructure. Local schools are already full and local roads congested at peak times.	yes
SR004	Environment Agency		<p><b>STRETTON 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>	-
SR005	Miss J Kirkland	Sections 2 and 3	<p>Section 2 - General comment – I agree that natural and historical sources should be preserved.</p> <p>Map 9- I can see no signage for the house known as Hall Green in Church Road which (although enlarged in the last 60 years or so) has always been known as the 'oldest house in</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>the village' and is referred to as such in various printed histories.</p> <p>Section 3 [Appendix 3?]- Strategic Policy 23 – Green Infrastructure – (d) [this is a reference to the draft Local Plan] states "new green infrastructure should be in keeping with existing landscape, including habitat types and species selection". Only yesterday I noticed "ornamental type trees" newly planted in an area near the canal (and rear of Social Club, Beech Lane. Willows or alders may have been more appropriate, so care <u>does</u> need to be taken over this.</p>	
SR006	Alan Wiggins	Protection of fields	<p>There are already 437 houses planned to be built in Stretton. This in itself will put added pressure on an already creaking infrastructure, i.e. roads, access to GPs, hospitals, school places, etc.</p> <p>By protecting the fields it will mean that we will not only be protecting the rural and ecological aspects of this area, we will also be maintaining our services at a level which will meet the needs of the people of Stretton. If the Grade II listed farm land is not protected, it will 'open the door' for developers such as Gladmans bringing with it a greatly reduced quality of life for the people of Stretton.</p>	yes
SR007	GA and PA Thorpe	Protection of fields	<p>The fields off Craythorne Road and Bitham Lane are grade 2 good quality agricultural land. It is most important that the fields have protection so they continue to produce good quality food. There are already 437 houses due to be built in Stretton, which will take up valuable land. These 437 will impact on life in Stretton, adding to traffic gridlock, overload on facilities in Stretton and surrounding areas. To build more houses would bring more congestion, more overloaded facilities and completely spoil what little open space we have at the moment. Stretton cannot sustain any more houses – it's as simple as that.</p>	yes
SR008	Mrs Sarah Jordan	Protection of fields	<p>The section in the Stretton Neighbourhood Plan which looks to protect the fields must remain. The fields in Stretton must be protected as it is grade 2, good quality agricultural land and as such must be protected.</p> <p>437 houses are already going to be built in Stretton and, as residents, we want to protect the</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			more rural aspects of our village and also avoid serious traffic gridlock and road safety issues. We also want to prevent a complete overload of all other facilities in Stretton, such as doctors, dentists and schools.	
SR009	Mr M A Jordan	Protection of fields	It is important that the section in the Stretton Neighbourhood Plan re the protection of the fields should remain. The fields in Stretton are Grade 2 good quality agricultural land and should be protected. There are more than 400 houses to be built in Stretton <u>village</u> and as residents we feel it is important to protect the rural aspects of our village. Whilst wanting to avoid serious traffic gridlock/road safety issues we are also concerned about other facilities ie doctors, dentists, schools etc.	yes
SR010	Graham Lamb	Policy S1	I wish to support this policy in the plan. With 436 houses already identified to be built in Stretton in the next few years there is a need to provide an amount of green space in the area and to not over develop. Much better to see the new houses built and fully evaluate the impact on the infrastructure in Stretton. In addition the 3 field areas that are still providing farming land are grade 2 and as such are fields that should not be built on if lesser grade sites are available. In fact there is not a lot of grade 2 land in ESBC , so any grade 2 land should be protected and lower grades of land and brownfield sites should be used. There is ample of that in ESBC to fully meet the Local Councils Plans.	yes
SR011	Graham and Michelle Wright	Housing	As 437 houses are already going to be built in Stretton, we feel that we need to protect our rural aspects of our village. We have traffic issues as it is, especially the junction of Church Road and Bridge Street. A38 is very congested too. Extensive problems obtaining doctors appointments too.	Yes
SR012	Mrs Juliet Astbury	Gladmans Craytho	No text	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		rne lane		
SR013	John & Lorraine Barrett	Protection of high-quality agric. land	<p>Stretton village is gradually being incorporated into the outskirts of Burton due to the Pirelli development.</p> <p>Should the fields off Craythorne Road be built on then the infrastructure of the village will be overloaded.</p> <p>Especially traffic congestion at junctions with Bitham Lane, Dovecliffe Road and at A38 Claymills. There will be road safety issues not just at these junctions but in Craythorne Road itself. It currently struggles to allow 2 vehicles to pass side by side in its current state let alone when 400+ houses are added.</p> <p>Then there are obvious effects on local schools, all overloaded, doctors and dentists already have waiting lists for appointments which will also affect local hospitals.</p> <p>Eventually if this proposal goes through then Stretton and Rolleston villages will lose their identity.</p>	yes
SR014	Diane Wiggins	Protection of Fields	<p>There are already plans for 437 houses for be built in Stretton. This will put added strain on an already creaking infrastructure (roads, access to GP services, hospital, school places etc). By protecting the fields, services will also be protected at a level which is sustainable. Equally importantly, the ecological balance and diversity in the area will be maintained. If the Grade 2 listed farm land is not protected, this will greatly reduce the quality of life for residents through increased traffic and other pollution, and also open the door to developers such as Gladmans to encroach on rural areas.</p>	yes
SR015	Aida Mcmanus of AM Planning Consultants on behalf of Mr R Field	Map 3 areas of identified open space. Policy S1,	<p>Policy S1 development in the Countryside – the NP states that these areas have been identified as countryside areas which is evidently incorrect specifically when looking at the land at the Farmhouse, Forge lane and the adjacent site at no.17 which both have outline planning permission to be developed for 2 dwellings in the case of the farmhouse P/2012/00916, and a detached dwelling and detached dwelling adjacent to no. 17 P/2012/00806.</p> <p>The farmhouse currently has submitted reserved matters and once approved development</p>	yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
		Policy S2	<p>could commence on that site. No. 17 currently has an amended application submitted to the LPA under P/2015/00936 which again would result in these areas being developed. It seems unnecessary and unreasonable to incorporate these areas into the Open Space when they already have the potential to be developed and already contain buildings on the site. There are other areas such as derby Road which specifically excludes existing dwellings from the open space area but the farmhouse has not been given the same approach.</p> <p>I agree with the inspectors report that Policy S1 should be deleted as it does not include a presumption in favour of sustainable development. I would also request that the open space around the farm house site and those with planning permission are deleted from the plan as its inclusion does not protect or safeguard land which doesn't have planning permission on and will be developed in the near future. Policy S2 does not have regard to the quality of existing mature trees or hedgerows and I concur with the Examiners recommendation.</p>	
SR016	Keith Mole	Policy S1	<p>I FEEL STRETTON'S PRESENT INFRASTRUCTURE OF ROADS, SCHOOLS AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES ARE NOT SUITABLE FOR FURTHER BUILDINGS OR DEVELOPMENTS.</p> <p>THE LAND THAT HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS IS GRADE 2 FARMING LAND AND THEREFORE VALUABLE FOR AGRICULTURE RATHER THAN BUILDINGS.</p> <p>I SUPPORT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</p>	SR016

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
SR017	Beverley Mole	Policy S1	<p>I WISH TO SUPPORT THE POLICIES WITHIN THE PLAN BECAUSE WE ARE LOOSING GREENSPACE AT A RAPID RATE AND I THINK IT IS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PROTECT WHAT WE STILL HAVE, AS SET DOWN IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN.</p> <p>I ALSO THINK IT IS VITAL TO PROTECT THE GRADE 2 FARMING LAND WE CURRENTLY HAVE BECAUSE IT IS SOME OF THE LAST REMAINING TOP QUALITY LAND IN EAST STAFFORDSHIRE. WE NEED TO PROTECT OUR COMMUNITY FOR THE PEOPLE OF STRETTON. THIS IS WHY I SUPPORT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN.</p>	Yes
SR018	James Chadwick Staffordshire County Council	Policy S1 and supporting Paragraphs 6.1.1 – 6.1.4	<p>We do not believe that this Policy meets the basic conditions in regard to paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) subsections (a) and (e) set out below for ease of reference:</p> <p>(a)having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order;</p> <p>(e)the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area),</p> <p>The text supporting Policy S1 states that the emphasis of the Neighbourhood Plan is to</p>	Yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>protect the settlement boundary. However, Policy S1 is positively framed to encourage development of certain types as suggested by the Inspector in her report to the previous submission plan. Policy S1 therefore seems contrary to the text in paragraph 6.1.4 and the types of development deemed suitable are in the main those associated with acceptable development in the Green Belt. It is unclear therefore whether the policy is trying to encourage or preclude development.</p> <p>Staffordshire County Council's direct concern with the policy relates to the parcel of land identified on Map 3 adjacent to the Craythorne Golf Course to the west of Stretton. This parcel of land has been the subject of a recent planning application by Gladmans, which has been refused. As part of the Local Plan strategy it has been established new school provision is required over and above that which has been directed to the Sustainable Urban Extensions due to in part constraints at existing schools preventing on-site extension. A study undertaken by AMEC (Local Plan examination document D.34) identifies sites with potential for consideration for new school provision. The site off Craythorne Road was included as having potential to deliver a new primary school. The application by Gladmans included within it land for a new school. Even though this application has been refused the site is still being considered as an option for school places by the County Council as Education Authority with the statutory responsibility for supply of school places.</p> <p>There is uncertainty whether Policy S1 would preclude the delivery of a school on the site off Craythorne Road. It certainly does not plan positively for such. It is the position of the County Council that this is therefore contrary to the Basic conditions set out above. In relation to Basic Condition (a) in August 2011 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government issues a policy statement – Planning for Schools Development:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6316/1966097.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6316/1966097.pdf</a></p> <p>This policy statement sets out the Government's commitment to support the development of state-funded schools and their delivery through the planning system. This includes a presumption in favour of development of state funded schools and encouragement of</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<p>collaborative working so the answer to proposals for state funded schools should wherever possible be yes. The evidence of the need for school places and the potential that this site offers has been in the public domain during the preparation of this Plan and the County Council's Representations to earlier drafts and the previous submission version have raised this as an issue. It is therefore contented that Policy S1 conflicts with National Policy and guidance from the Secretary of State.</p> <p>In relation to Basic Condition (e) it is argued that the policy is not in accordance with the Strategic Policies in the Local Plan. The Basic condition statement implies Policy S1 relies on conformity with Policy SP8 – Development Outside of Settlement Boundaries of the Local Plan 2012-2031. However, the Basic condition statement refers to an out of date policy. During the course of the Local Plan examination Policy SP8 has been subject to modifications. Policy SP8 in the latest version of the Plan is copied below.</p> <p><b>STRATEGIC POLICY 8 - Development Outside Settlement Boundaries</b></p> <p>Development outside settlement boundaries will not be permitted unless it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• essential to the support and viability of an existing lawful business or the creation of a new business appropriate in the countryside in terms of type of operation, size and impact and supported by relevant justification for a rural location; or</li> <li>• providing facilities for the use of the general public or local community close to an existing settlement which is reasonably accessible on foot, by bicycle or by public transport; or</li> <li>• in accordance with a 'made' (i.e. legally in force) Neighbourhood Plan; or</li> <li>• development under the Rural Exception Sites policy (see Policy 18 on Exception Sites); or</li> <li>• <b>Appropriate re-use of Rural Buildings following guidance set out in the Rural Buildings SPD; or</b></li> </ul>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>infrastructure development where an overriding need for the development to be located in the countryside can be demonstrated; or</b></li> <li>• <b>development necessary to secure a significant improvement to the landscape or the conservation of a feature of acknowledged importance; or</b></li> <li>• <b>provision for renewable energy generation, of a scale and design appropriate to its location.</b></li> <li>• otherwise appropriate in the countryside.</li> </ul> <p>Of note is the sixth bullet point referring to infrastructure development. Page 104 of the Local Plan contains a definition of 'Infrastructure' and this includes education. As part of the Local Plan examination the County Council has made representations suggesting that whilst Infrastructure development is allowed outside of settlement boundaries given the evidence available new schools should be explicitly referenced in SP8. We await the Inspectors report on this matter of detail, but it is clear that Policy S1 of the Neighbourhood Plan is contrary to Policy SP8 of the Local Plan as drafted which recognises that infrastructure development in the countryside may be necessary. The evidence base for the Local Plan clearly makes the case for new school provision that there is an overriding need for these to be outside of settlement boundaries given the lack of available sites within the urban area that are suitable.</p> <p>It should be noted that the bulk of a new school site 75-85% is made up of outdoor green space in playing fields and habitat areas in line with national school building design guidance.</p> <p>Given the above it is suggested that Policy S1 needs to be amended to conform with National and Local Policy in order to meet the basic conditions and that education infrastructure be included in the list of permitted uses.</p>	

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
SR019	John Fleming Gladman Developments		SEE SEPARATE ATTACHMENTS SR019A to SR019O	Yes
SR020	Lorraine Matthews	Policies S1,S2,S3 S4,S5,S6	<p><i>I would like to see the sense of community + local facilities maintained + generally enjoyed - the green areas, woods, wildlife + opportunities for well being in the area.</i></p> <p><i>I agree that any new business related development be located on brownfield sites or make use of existing buildings.</i></p> <p><i>I absolutely agree that open countryside surrounding Stretton be protected and open spaces enhanced for all.</i></p> <p><i>Hedgerows should be protected as well as all other areas of wildlife interest.</i></p> <p><i>All surrounding farmland and open countryside should be protected and maintained and no more housing should be built on any of these remaining areas!</i></p> <p><i>I believe this Neighbourhood Plan incorporated Local inhabitants wishes and should be adopted and upheld.</i></p>	Yes

Representation number	Person or organisation	Policy	Representation	Do they want to be informed of decision?
SR021	Andy Bromley	Policies S1,S2,S3 S4,S5,S6	<p>I agree that 'brownfield' sites should be developed.</p> <p>I agree that the Plan helps to protect the 'green space' that exists on the outskirts of the village.</p> <p>Farmland is at a premium and needs protecting.</p> <p>I believe that the Plan incorporates local inhabitants views and helps maintain the Real of the village.</p> <p>I believe the Plan should be adopted and upheld.</p> <p><small>ease use a separate form for each representation.</small></p>	Yes