

## Colwich Neighbourhood Plan

### Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 9 October – 20 November 2015.

Representation ID	Name/organisation	Policy / Section commented on.	Do they support or object to the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan?	Do they wish to be notified of the decision?	Summary of Representations
CNP1	Staffordshire County Council	Section 8.6, 4.7	Object	N/A	<p>Querying the infrastructure costs as set out in Table 2; in particular the flood defence scheme at Coley Lane and the highway schemes. There has been no agreement with Staffordshire County Council to fund the schemes referred to in the table; these references should be deleted.</p> <p>In relation to Appendix I (Highways Deficiencies), it should be made clear that the issues identified will require further discussion with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>In relation to section 4.7 the Plan gives a misleading picture to developers on the capacity of Education provision. Alternative figures are proposed.</p>

CNP2	A P Jayes	General	Support	N/A	Support for the document.
CNP3	Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Section 8.4	Object	N/A	Failure to include Land at Mill Lane, Great Haywood. The Plan fails to provide sufficient flexibility over the Plan period, is not in accordance with National Planning Policy and does not conform with the Local Plan.
CNP4	Environment Agency	General, Policy CI5,	N/A	N/A	<p>The proposed solar farm north of Great Haywood Marina and the 'Canalside Site' at Great Haywood Junction are affected by flooding. The sites, if allocated for development, should be supported by a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Any proposal for a burial site must ensure that there is no unacceptable risk to groundwater quality.</p> <p>Support for the biodiversity policies in the Plan. Welcomes the opportunity to feed into any Green Infrastructure Plan developed for the area.</p>
CNP5	G. D Bourne	Section 9	Object	Yes	Object to the Wolseley Bridge separation zone as it is part of an agricultural holding.

CNP6	Fisher German on behalf of the Lichfield Diocesan Board of Finance	Policy C15	Object	N/A	Object to the proposed burial ground site in Policy C15 due to its isolation from the village, poor access, uncertainty over the suitability of ground conditions and willingness of the owner to sell.
CNP7	Natural England	Policy CE5, CE6	Support	N/A	Supports policies CE5 (Nature Conservation Sites) and CE6 (Biodiversity) for their positive approach and creation of ecological networks.  No comment to make on the final stage screening report for the Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment.
CNP8	Mr P Cockbill	General	Object	Yes	Objects to development proposals in general.
CNP9	Moore Family Trust	Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9	Object	Yes	Section 3.4 – the Parish Council have not consulted with the Moore Family Trust in relation to the land allocations in the Plan. Insufficient housing has been allocated in the Plan.  Section 4.4 - it should be noted that there is a need for bungalows/small houses for a large elderly population in the Neighbourhood Area.

					<p>Section 4.5 – land lying to the west and north of Little Haywood and to the east of Colwich should not be prohibited from development due to historic environment issues.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.8 is inaccurate; the Moore Family Trust has not been asked to participate in the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2.1 – the proposed settlement boundary does not allow for additional small developments as stated in 7.2.1 (h).</p> <p>Policy CLE4 – concern re the parking issues associated with the Hazeldene Surgery allocation.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.4.6 Table 1 – it is inaccurate to show ‘The Ring’ allocation as part of housing provision for Little Haywood.</p> <p>Further housing allocation is required in Policy CC1. CC2 should not include the Moore Family Trust as a ‘Zone of Separation’. ‘The Ring’ should not be separated from Little Haywood.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>CE4 (Local Green Space) – the allocations should not be included due to a lack of consultation with the landowners and Map 15 should be re-drafted. Some of the tracts proposed are too extensive, have not received an adequate assessment or are unsuitable for designation.</p> <p>Policy CE8 (Historic Highways) – such matters should be dealt with through the planning process not within the Neighbourhood Plan. C15 (Land for Burial Ground) – the site is not suitable on accessibility grounds.</p> <p>Appendix J should relate to affordable housing policy as set out by Stafford Borough Council and Central Government.</p>
CNP10	Staffordshire County Council Environment Advice Team		Support (but with some suggested amendments)	N/A	<p>Support for Policy CE6 (Biodiversity).</p> <p>Historic environment approach supported in general but the potential for archaeological remains within the Neighbourhood Plan Area could have been expanded upon.</p> <p>Section 7.2.1 – amend the text to ‘Conserve and Enhance the visual and historic character of the villages’.</p>

					<p>CC4 (Rural Development) – consideration should be given to the sustainable re-use of historic farm buildings.</p> <p>Rights of Way – there is a lack of information about any proposals to improve provision for equestrians. The Plan proposed the creation of new footpaths and cycleways but does not contain any details of how this could be achieved; some suggestions are provided.</p>
CNP11	Yes Planning	Appendix H	Object	N/A	<p>Object to the conclusion that site CP28 set out in Appendix H (Land off Mill Lane, Great Haywood) is not currently developable. The constraints identified of surface water flooding and location within a Mineral Safeguard Area for Sand and Gravel are inaccurate/not a sufficient reason for disregarding the site.</p>