

**Stoke upon Tern Neighbourhood Development Plan
Consultation Statement
April 2018**

Contents

Introduction

Summary of Community Engagement

Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

Appendix A – List of Statutory and other Consultees

Appendix B - Consultation Comments Received and Response Made

Introduction

This Consultation Statement summarises the community engagement programme and the Regulation 14 consultation that were undertaken for the Stoke upon Tern Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017 - 2033). It shows how the requirements of Regulations 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 have been satisfied.

Summary of Community Engagement

Stoke upon Tern Parish Council developed a programme of community and stakeholder engagement and this has been used to guide the process of producing the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council recognises that the Neighbourhood Plan must reflect the needs of the community and the locality and the Council has sought to communicate with the residents and business owners in a timely and effective manner and to inform and actively engage with them throughout the process. The community engagement carried out on behalf the Parish Council in producing the draft Neighbourhood Plan is summarised in the community engagement table.

The strategy for community engagement

Throughout the preparation of the plan we regularly consulted and engaged the community. Since the launch in June 2015 we have:

1. Provided regular updates in the local newsletter, which is published 4 times a year.
2. Used the Parish Council website to provide information about for the neighbourhood plan.
3. Produced a community questionnaire in September 2015, a business questionnaire in January 2016 and a housing needs survey in June 2016.
4. Gave an update at every Parish Council Meeting since 2015.
5. Held Community Meetings and Workshops between March and June 2016, as is set out in the table overleaf.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN		
Date	Method	Purpose
June 2015	Newsletter	Announcing forthcoming community engagement events this was delivered to all households within the parish.
July 2015	Community Engagement	A stall at Wistanswick fete also engaged with local people to promote the Neighbourhood plan and begin to identify the key issues and themes for the plan.
July 2015	Event Flyer	Again to all households, advertising these 5 workshops, which took place in different locations within the parish in August 2015.
August-September 2015	Community Events	5 Events delivered across the Parish to gather evidence shaping the scope of the plan, identifying the issues and aspirations of the community. This also raised areas that would require further in depth evidence gathering such as local business need and housing need.
September 2015	Community Questionnaire	As part of the stakeholder engagement a community questionnaire was sent to all local residents in the NP area.
September 2015	Newsletter	Accompanying the questionnaire a newsletter also summarised the previous community events and provided an update on the NP.
October 2015	Stakeholder Events	A further event was held with local amenity groups in October 2015.
December 2015	Newsletter	Status Update
January – February 2016	Questionnaire	Canvas opinion of businesses, both large and small throughout the Parish
March 2016	Newsletter	Input sought on Highway Traffic survey
March-May 2016	Community meetings	Serving as an update on the NP process, informing the development of the draft document and shaping of the NP template.
April-June 2016	Community Workshops	A number of community workshops, exploring the scope of the plan, and determining the vision and aims.
June 2016	Housing Needs Survey	A Housing Needs survey was included in the June 2016 Newsletter to provide critical evidence to inform the housing policies of the NP.
September 2016	Newsletter	Further Housing Needs Input sought
December 2016	Newsletter	Reminders to complete Housing Survey
Oct – Nov 2017	Various	Regulation 14 Consultation

The Neighbourhood Plan preparation has been led by the Stoke upon Tern Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group which is made up of Parish Councillors, supported by neighbourhood planning specialists, Urban Vision Enterprise.

Who was targeted?

Throughout the Neighbourhood Plan process we have tried to engage with the Stoke upon Tern residents at all stages. The process began with an announcement of future events in the Parish Newsletter which is delivered to all household. This was followed by a promotional stall at the Wistanswick village fete and subsequently flyers and questionnaires, again circulated to all residents,

were used to inform the process. Workshops and meetings by invitation were held with local Stakeholders in October 2015.

A questionnaire covering the likely issues and aspirations of the local community was circulated to all households in September 2015; opinions were canvassed in a business questionnaire to all local businesses in January and February 2016, and subsequently a detailed Housing Needs Survey was sent out in June 2016.

Outcomes/Feedback

The opinions and comments arising from community engagement exercises help form the basis on which this plan was written. Likewise, the policies are formed both on community engagement and based on a clear planning rationale, underpinned by relevant data/evidence.

The main issues emerging were affordable housing/downsizing, including a wish for bungalows, provision for travellers, and improvements in Broadband provision.

Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

Following the completion of the draft Neighbourhood Plan it was posted on the Parish Council website and hard copies were placed in various locations within the Parish and the surrounding area. A Consultation Response Form was delivered to all households within the parish, detailing the whereabouts of the document and providing a variety of means of return for said responses. 2 drop-in sessions were held in November 2017 to provide further information and to answer any questions.

Advice was sought from Shropshire Council about an agreed list of statutory and other consultees and they were all individually approached by email and directed to the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The list of consultees is found in Appendix A.

Local businesses were approached directly by members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

Consultation Comments made and responses

Comments were logged and analysed by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and decisions made on any amendments necessary to the Plan. Details of all these comments and decisions made can be found in Appendix B.

Conclusions

The policies identified in the Neighbourhood Plan have arisen from the concerns and wishes of the community of Stoke upon Tern. This is shown by the small number of consultees who have raised concerns. This reflects a general consensus and indicates that the Plan is largely non-controversial, which we hope will be demonstrated at the referendum.

Appendix A

Statutory and Other Consultees

Name	Title	Organisation	Address
Rebecca McLean	Lead Catchment Planner	Severn Trent	Severn Trent
Stuart Morgans	Planning Manager,	Sport England	West Midlands – Central Hub
Rachael A. Bust	Chief Planner / Principal Manager Planning and Local Authority Liaison	The Coal Authority	200 Lichfield Lane Berry Hill Mansfield Nottinghamshire NG18 4RG
Alison Heine	Planner	Heine Planning	10 Whitehall Dr, Hartford, Northwich, Cheshire CW8 1SJ
A. R. Yarwood, DipTP, MRTPI,	Planning Officer	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Ladygrove Mill, Two Dales Matlock DE4 FG
Peter Boland	Historic Places Advisor	Historic England	The Axis 10 Holliday Street Birmingham B1 1TG
Graeme Irwin	Senior Planning Officer - Sustainable Places	Environment Agency	West Midlands Area
Dewi Griffiths	Forward Plans Officer Developer Services	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	Kinmel Park Depot Royal Welsh Avenue Bodelwyddan LL18 5TQ
Diane Clarke	Assoc RTPI Town Planning Technician LNW	Network Rail	Floor 1 Square One 4 Travis Street Manchester, M1 2NY
Jodie McCabe	Senior Town Planner Environment & Planning Support	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Kingston Road, Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands, B75 7RL
David Fletcher	Service Delivery Manager	Telford & Wrekin Council	Development Management Business, Development & Employment, Telford & Wrekin Council, PO BOX457 1 st Floor, Wellington Civic Offices, Telford TF2 2FH
Jane Evans	Clerk	Hodnet Parish Council	51, Longford Turning, Market Drayton TF9 3PF
Cllr Len Sambrook	Chairman	Childs Ercall Parish Council	Ercall Grange, St Michaels Way, Childs Ercall TF9 2DB
Jane Evans	Clerk	Moreton Saye Parish Council	51, Longford Turning, Market Drayton TF9 3PF
Graham Bould	Clerk	Sutton upon Tern Parish Council	18, Mendip Close, Little Dawley, Telford TF4 3JG

Appendix B

Consultation Comments Received and Comments Made

A. National and Statutory Bodies

Environment Agency Letter 2nd October 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>Neighbourhood Plans should offer robust confirmation that development is not impacted by flooding and that there is sufficient waste water infrastructure in place to accommodate growth for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p>The Flood Map provides an indication of 'fluvial' flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with the drainage team at Shropshire Council in their role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). The LLFA also has responsibility for local flood risk management and may hold flooding information that is not identified on our Flood Map</p> <p>The Clive Barracks Community Hub (500 houses), some watercourses have not been modelled on our Flood Maps. The Clive Barracks hub is bisected by a small un-modelled watercourse which should be considered moving forward with Plan.</p>	<p>The site allocations were made by the Local Plan, rather than this NP. So flood risk issues should already be covered by the Local Plan. This should be discussed with Shropshire Council.</p>	<p>Depends on discussion with Shropshire Council.</p>

The Environment Agency also included a consultation pro-forma, setting out sources of environmental information and containing advice on issues like flood risk and climate change.

Sport England Letter 13th November 2018

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>The response highlights NPPF policy on sport and its own guidance.</p> <p>Supports the vision statement, although it would be beneficial to also include within it a reference to promoting healthy communities to be consistent with guidance in section 8 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Including promoting healthy communities in the vision statement may be desirable.</p>	<p>Consider amending vision statement to include reference to supporting 'healthy communities'.</p>
<p>A suitably worded reference that makes the link between provision and enhancement of sport and recreation to the health and well-being of the neighbourhood would ensure consistency with existing Development Plan documents and the NPPF ...</p> <p>... SUTA3 should make it clear that the reference to green space includes sports and recreation facilities including playing fields, again to be consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF ...</p>	<p>Neighbourhood plans do not have to include policies on all subjects. However, this may be a useful addition.</p>	<p>Consider adding text to recognise the link between sport and recreation facilities to health and well-being.</p> <p>Consider amending SUTA3 to make reference to sport and recreation.</p>
<p>Dutton Close Community Hub - The site has been previously used as playing field (see below). It is acknowledged that this was several years ago, however Sport England would need to be convinced that it does not constitute playing field for which there would be a presumption against its loss unless it was demonstrated to be surplus.</p> <p>... Sport England therefore objects to the allocation of the Community Hub in the Neighbourhood Plan. Either the</p>	<p>The site allocation was made by the Local Plan, rather than this NP. It would be useful to check the Local Plan allocation to see if the requirements of Paragraph 74 of the NPPF were met. Note, the Local Plan allocation required retention of the recreation ground. Suggest discussing this with the LPA.</p> <p>Need to make clear that the NP is not amending the LP site allocation.</p>	<p>This was more a matter for the Local Plan, which was adopted in 2015.</p>

<p>allocated playing fields should be removed from the allocation, or suitable amendments made to the Plan to address these issues.</p>		
<p>Clive Barracks Community Hub - There are concerns that the identification of up to 500 additional dwellings could result in the loss of sports and recreation facilities without appropriate justification or compensation for their loss. In the absence of an up to date evidence base that identifies it to be surplus the playing field should be protected from development ...</p> <p>... In addition, it is noted that this major development opportunity is not included within the adopted Core Strategy or the SAMdev, but will bring with it a level of housing growth that may generate additional infrastructure needs for sport and recreation. The plan should cross refer to policy CS9 of the Core Strategy relates to Infrastructure Contributions to be consistent with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Sport England therefore objects to the allocation of the Community Hub in the Neighbourhood Plan. Either the allocated playing fields should be removed from the allocation, or suitable amendments made to the Plan to address these issues.</p>	<p>Sport England’s statement that this major development is not covered by the SAMdev appears to contradict Page 24 of the NP document. This needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Discuss with LPA possible contributions (Section 106).</p>	<p>Clarification of the status of this site in the SAMdev is required.</p> <p>If necessary, the neighbourhood plan could highlight any Local Plan requirements for contributions to sport/recreation. This could include making reference to the Place Plan as a tool for implementation.</p>
<p>Policy CAF1 - The requirement for an assessment of the level of formal outdoor space (including sports facilities) that proposals should deliver is</p>	<p>The policy is very specific and prescriptive in incorporating the exact FIT standard. The needs-based approach advocated by Sport England</p>	<p>Suggest modified policy requiring developers to assess local provision and local need to accompany planning applications.</p>

<p>generally supported. However, the reference to this being in line with Fields in Trust guidance, which results in the application of a standards based approach is not supported, as this does not deliver the provision of sports and recreational facilities (including playing fields) to meet identified needs. The NPPF is silent on the issue of local standards and Sport England does not advocate the use of local standards. Rather, the guidance in the NPPF is that requirements for open space, sports and recreation facilities are informed by a robust and up-to-date evidence (see paragraphs 70, 73 and 74 of the NPPF). A clear understanding of current and future community sports facility needs for the area is essential to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan accords with the NPPF. The Shropshire Playing Pitch Strategy adopted in 2010 is not considered to be reliable as an up to date evidence base ...</p> <p>... Sport England considers that this evidence should be prepared, and for policy CAF1 to be amended to explicitly refer to it, so that the policy requires planning applications for housing to be supported by an assessment of the level of formal indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities (including playing fields) to be provided to meet the needs of the development, that reflects the up to date evidence base.</p>	<p>would fit NPPF policy more closely.</p>	<p>This could be based on the following:</p> <p>Policy CAF1: Local Play, Sports and Recreational Facilities</p> <p>New residential development must be supported by a balanced range of play, sport and recreational facilities, existing or new. The capacity of existing facilities and the additional demand created by new development must be considered and addressed.</p> <p>Where residential sites are developed incrementally, a masterplan must be prepared in advance to ensure that the development of the complete site will be adequately supported by play, sports and recreational facilities.</p>
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not identify how it relates to Shropshire's Implementation Plan and Market Drayton Place</p>	<p>It is not for the NP to update local authority strategies.</p>	<p>The policy amendment described above will help to address.</p>

<p>Plan, which would need to be updated to reflect the development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. In the absence of an up-to-date evidence base, it is not possible to demonstrate that the identified projects in the existing Shropshire Implementation Plan and Market Drayton Place Plan will address the infrastructure needs of the development identified in the Neighbourhood Plan ...</p>		
---	--	--

Historic England Letter 26th October 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>Historic England is supportive of the objectives set out in the Plan and the content of the document and particularly commend its' stated intention to:</p> <p><i>"preserve and enhance Stoke upon Tern's rural character (and) ensure that all new development in Stoke upon Tern is designed to high standards (and) responds and contributes to the distinctive built character of its setting"</i>.</p> <p>... Overall the plan reads as a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document which we consider takes a suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment of the Parish".</p>		<p>No change.</p>
<p>On a minor point we note that the wording of Policy D1, in its second sentence, appears to be incomplete.</p>	<p>The wording of D1 (first paragraph) should be amended to make a simple statement that development should comply with the following requirements. The reference to the design and access statement could be</p>	<p>Amend D1 as described.</p>

	moved to the end of the policy.	
<p>As a general point, the Parish clearly has a strong agricultural base and numerous historic farmsteads. Whilst we support, as the Plan suggests, the conversion to beneficial uses, including employment uses, of redundant historic buildings we are concerned to ensure that this is done in a sensitive manner. Therefore we suggest that you consider the inclusion of the following Policy wording in an appropriate section of the Neighbourhood Plan viz:</p> <p><i>“Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form. Due reference should be made and full consideration be given to the Shropshire Farmsteads Characterisation Project”.</i></p> <p><u>https://new.shropshire.gov.uk/environment/historic-environment/historic-farmstead-characterisation/</u></p>	<p>Need to consider whether the design policy is adequate without modification.</p> <p>It is poor practice to refer to external documents, which may be revoked or altered during the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>The design policy could be amended, setting out specific requirements for farmsteads (which could be taken from the document referred to).</p>	<p>Consider adding farmsteads to the design policy, setting out specific requirements rather than referring to an external document.</p> <p>Or, add notes to the existing design policy clarifying how it relates to farmsteads.</p> <p>Suggested Additional Text for Policy D1:</p> <p>Application of Policy: (After First Para)</p> <p>The Parish contains Historic Farmsteads and where applications are submitted for these Policy D1 should ensure high-quality materials are used, which could include well-finished and durable modern materials or authentic historic materials, including authentic vernacular materials such as Staffordshire Blues. It would not include ‘mock’ traditional materials, such as plastic fascias or standard concrete roof tiles.</p>

Coal Authority Letter 13th November 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
No comment		No change.

Network Rail email 4th October 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
No comments.		No change.

Defence Infrastructure email 30th November 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
We support and welcome the references to Clive Barracks in the document, but would like to see a higher number of dwellings referred to in the Local Housing Need section on page 24. The discussions with Shropshire Council to date have indicated a figure more like 600+ on the Clive Barracks site (with further housing provision on MOD land across the A41 outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area). Clearly the final capacity of the site will be dependent on the outcome of the technical studies and masterplanning work we are procuring, however we would like to see a reference to “in the region of 600 additional dwellings” within the Neighbourhood Plan rather than up to 500.	The figure of 500 houses came from the Local Planning Authority, and it is outwith the Neighbourhood Plan process to change the LPA numbers. With the proviso that the capacity of the site will be dependent on technical studies and masterplanning, it is not considered necessary to change the text.	No change.

Severn Trent Letter 9th January 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>The letter is mainly about Severn Trent's approach to planning applications and also building regulation matters. There are no actual comments on the content of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, the letter does state that:</p> <p>We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.</p>	<p>SUDS and permeable surfaces could be referred to by policy in the NP.</p>	<p>Policy D1 could be amended to include SUDS (Sustainable urban drainage systems) and permeable surfaces.</p> <p>Suggested Additional Text for Policy D1:</p> <p>Bullet Point 17: Ensuring permeable surfaces in hard landscaped areas; Bullet Point 18: Incorporating Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems designed as part of the landscaping scheme.</p>
<p>Severn Trent also submitted a spreadsheet giving data (water cycle study).</p>	<p>This data is mainly relevant to the local planning authority with regard to site allocations and planning applications.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Welsh Water email 2nd October 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>The Neighbourhood Plan area falls outside of our operational area, as such we have no comment to make.</p>		<p>No change.</p>

B. Local Organisations

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups Letter 13th November 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>We commend the Parish Council for recognising the requirement to address the needs of the Travelling community. It is refreshing to find a Parish Council which is prepared to include such a policy in its neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We fully support the inclusion of Policy H3, which we consider to be a fair and balanced approach to addressing this need.</p>		No change.

The Future of Rural Bus Services in Shropshire Letter 20th November 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>I would be very grateful indeed if you would send me any information you already have available on bus services in your council's area and how you would like to see them improved. This could be new bus routes, new ways of providing bus services, increased frequencies and additional services in the evenings, bank holidays and weekends.</p>	<p>This is a request for information rather than a representation.</p>	No change.

C. Local Authorities and Parish Councils

Telford and Wrekin Council email 21st November 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
-----------------------------------	----------	------------------------------------

No issues to raise.		No change.
---------------------	--	------------

Moreton Parish Council email 17th October 2017

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
No comment.		No change.

Hodnet Parish Council email 31st October

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
No comments.		No change.

Sutton Parish Council email 27th November

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
Support policies, no objections.		No change.

Emails (9th and 10th November) were also included from Leonard Sambrook of Childs Erccall PC, but these appear to be correspondence rather than representations on the NP in response to the Regulation 14 consultation.

D. Private Sector

Heine Planning email 13th November

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Suggested Modification for the NDP
<p>Welcome the inclusion of Policy H3 for Travellers but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the Plan should detail where sites are and how large they are the level of need should be informed by need assessments but this is not a ceiling limit, only a guide. 	<p>The NP could identify where sites are, though this may effectively allocate such sites.</p> <p>Suggest making the evidence and rationale section to the policy even clearer, placing emphasis</p>	<p>Consider modifying the policy to:</p> <p>Amended Policy: Permission will be considered for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation on the two sites, the Paddocks, Warrant Road (8 pitches) and Abdo Hill Farm (4 pitches) and marked on plan Existing Sites providing that it:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the requirement for sites to be no greater than 5 pitches to be unnecessary given the recent approval for the 8 pitch site at The Paddocks Warrant Road where it was agreed this was acceptable. • Consider there is no justification to limit existing sites (where ever they areas they are not identified) to no more than 8 pitches. 	<p>on the need to avoid compromising the rural character of the area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design and layout is appropriate to the rural context and include a landscaping plan; • Each site should not exceed the existing capacity ; and • Demonstrate that proposals do not dominate the countryside setting. <p>Also suggest make clearer and update the planning rationale to cover:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Policy is based on rural character. 2) Include reference to the 2 planning appeals and sites that the policy relates to. 3) The planning appeals meet local need for not only the 'fair share' of the Neighbourhood Area but also a majority of the need for Shropshire.
--	---	--

