

Colwich Parish Council

Colwich Neighbourhood Plan
Consultation Statement

September 2015

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Regulatory requirements
3. Neighbourhood Plan Committee.
4. Early consultation
5. Questionnaire
6. Public Consultation.
7. Pre-submission consultation.
8. Results of Pre-Submission consultation and modifications made to Submission Plan

Appendices

Appendix 1: Reports of consultative meetings.

Appendix 2: Community Survey Questionnaire.

Appendix 3: Youth survey.

Appendix 4: Feedback leaflet.

Appendix 5: Notes of meetings with neighbouring councils.

Appendix 6. Comments on Pre-submission Draft.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Colwich Neighbourhood Plan covers the entire Colwich Parish area. It contains a Vision Statement, 8 Key Issues, 28 Objectives and 31 planning policies. Like the Plan for Stafford Borough (PFSB) it covers the period 2011 to 2031. When the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted its policies will form part of the Development Plan for the area and will be used, alongside the planning policies in the PFSB, to determine planning applications in Colwich Parish.

2. Regulatory requirements

2.1 Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires that when submitted to the Local Planning Authority, a proposed Neighbourhood Plan must be accompanied by a consultation statement. This consultation statement must include::

- details of the person and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan,
- an explanation as to how they were consulted,
- a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

2.2 This report fulfils the legal requirements for the statutory pre-submission consultation stage of the Neighbourhood Plan and also describes the consultation and community engagement which took place during the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3. Neighbourhood Plan Committee.

3.1 In late 2011 Colwich Parish Council set up a Neighbourhood Plan Committee in order to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the Localism Act 2011.

3.2 In July 2013 eight residents were coopted on to the Committee to lend their special knowledge and expertise.

4. Community Engagement

4.1 Publicity events were held in June 2012 and in April and June 2013. In April 2013 in Great Haywood Memorial Hall the first formal Community Engagement Event took place. This was followed by a whole series of consultation events with village organisations, landowners, developers and other key stakeholders. (Appendix 1)

Colwich Parish Council added a Neighbourhood Plan section to its existing web site and began to include an article on the Neighbourhood Plan in the quarterly Parish Newsletter. Every Annual Parish Meeting has included a presentation about the Neighbourhood Plan.

4.2 The Borough Council consulted on the village conservation areas at Great Haywood Memorial Hall on 15th August 2013 and the Parish Council was there to consult on the Neighbourhood Plan. A popular feature of the consultation was the introduction of the revised Village Design Statement produced in 2001. The main intention of these early surveys was to identify issues for a residents' questionnaire.

5. Questionnaire.

5.1 With a grant from Planning Aid a Planning expert worked with the Committee to produce a parish questionnaire of which 6,000 were distributed to every household with the Parish Council Newsletter on 13th December 2013. (Appendix 2). A Youth Survey was also launched for completion on-line.(Appendix 3).

5.2 The Neighbourhood Plan Committee analysed the returns using a spreadsheet. There was a 10% return. In April 2014 the Committee produced a feedback/consultation leaflet which was distributed over Easter 2014. (Appendix 4)

5.3 Informed by the data contained in the Borough Council's Evidence Base and other authoritative sources the Committee started drafting a Neighbourhood Plan that would respond to the needs and wishes of the Parish.

6. Public consultation.

6.1 In early May 2014 a weekend was devoted to public engagement the highlight of which was a Parish meeting devoted to the Neighbourhood Plan explaining how the Committee were responding to residents views.

6.2 Over the summer meetings were held with Brocton PC, Ingestre with Tixall PC and Brindley Heath PC. Consultation stalls were set up at two events over the 12/13th July 2014 weekend. Two school visits were made late Nov/early Dec 2014.

6.3 In May an early draft of the Neighbourhood Plan was distributed to selected organisations for comments and a final draft of the Plan was launched at the Annual Parish meeting on 1st June 2015 which signalled the start of the pre-submission consultation.

7. Pre-submission consultation.

7.1 Notices were placed in noticeboards around the Parish and a report about the consultation opportunity appeared in the Staffordshire Newsletter.

7.2 Consultation leaflets were sent out to all residents inviting comments by email, personal visit to the Parish Office, by telephone to the clerk or a Councillor, in writing, face-to-face at consultation events or via the feedback forms provided. Consultation events were held on 20th June and 24th and 27th July.

7.3 A copy of the Neighbourhood Plan was put on the website and hard copies made available at the SPA shop, Canal Side Farm shop, Clifford Arms, Red Lion, St. Michael's church, St. John's church and the Parish Centre.

7.4 The following people and organisations were specifically consulted:

Neighbouring Parishes (by email):

- Brocton Parish Council
- Berkswich Parish Council

- Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council
- Weston Parish Council
- Hixon Parish Council
- Colton Parish Council
- Blithfield Parish Council
- Brindley Heath Parish Council
- Rugeley Town Council

7.5 Organisations/Statutory Consultees (by email):

- Staffordshire County Council
- Stafford Borough Council
- The Coal Authority
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- The Environment Agency
- The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
- Network Rail
- The Highways Agency
- NHS
- National Grid
- Western Power Distribution
- Severn Trent Water Ltd
- Cannock Chase AONB
- Canal and River Trust.
- Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
- St Michael's School
- St. John's School.
- Colwich School
- Yes Engineering
- Les Stephan Planning
- Barton Willmore

7.6 The consultation period ran from 1st June to the 28th July.

Comments are reproduced in full in Appendix 6. Below is a summary of comments received along with the response of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee and the associated modifications made to the Plan.

8. Results of Pre-Submission consultation and modifications made to Submission Plan

8.1 The following provides a section by section summary of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan with the comments made and how these have been responded to.

Contents:

Contents updated, Index expanded, Appendices updated to reflect the following changes.

Section 1: Introduction.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor drafting of this Section, 2. Inappropriate inclusion of text proper to this Consultation Statement. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reword paragraph about status of Plan, delete paras relating to pre-submission and reword para about latter stages of Plan process. 2. Delete paragraph about statutory process to prepare Plan,

Section 2: Planning policy context.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Para about Basic Conditions lacks reference Town & Country Planning Act 1990. 2. Meaning of 'sustainability' not clear. 3. Does not support strategic development needs of wider area. 4. Needs HRA Assessment, 5. No need to explain HRA and SEA as done in screening assessment, 6. Further development should be sought, 7. Clarify settlement hierarchy, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Added reference to Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to opening para of Section 3. 2. Defined Sustainable Development in glossary, 3. Is for the PFSB. 4. and 5. Deleted para relating to HRA and SEA, 6. Policy CC3 reworded to give extra support for local people to access affordable housing, 7. Settlement hierarchy sentence in para on relationship between PFSB and Colwich Neighbourhood Plan rewritten.

Section 3: The neighbourhood area.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. section should be reduced to one page 2. section should expanded references to Tolldish, J.R.R. Tolkien, railway services, effects of HS2, bus route details, Census, Cannock Chase AONB and Special Area of Conservation, landscape character types and Conservation Areas, Shugborough Estate, significance of Wolseley Park, 3. describe limit of Green Belt, 4. need to address light pollution, 5. give full names of Conservation Areas and include on a separate plan of the area along with the location of all other designated heritage assets within the area. 6. Significance of Planning Inspector's comments on application for development on The Butts, 7. short term effect of lack of sewage capacity, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. and 2. Important to describe the current state of the Parish and hopefully have got balance right by adding some small references in reaction to comments about missing items whilst moving paras that directly support policies to Section 8. 2. HS2 appears in may comments but too early to consider so it has been included in subjects to consider in the Monitor and Review Section, 2. Reduced bus details as they are constantly changing, 3. Extra text about extent of Green Belt added to para 4.5.4. 4. Para on lighting added to CC1 Design. 5. With four Conservation Area Appraisals covering the Parish the addition of maps would add considerably to the length of Section 3 without doing justice to the quality and extent of

	<p>these documents but the full titles have been included for ease of reference and improved information on Heritage asset location added to Appendix E.</p> <p>6. Responded to Inspector's comments on The Butts by adding further information to support Local Green Spaces 4 – 9.</p> <p>7. Reworded para 4.6.4.1 to make it clear that limitation on sewage treatment is not permanent.</p>
--	---

Section 4: Community engagement

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
1. Lack of consultation about land at The Butts.	None. Land at The Butts is the subject of a new planning application.

Section 5: Key issues

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
1. No mention of fluvial flooding.	Reference to fluvial flooding added to Section 5.

Section 6: Vision and objectives.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. Absence of policies relating to the heritage environment.</p> <p>2. Concern about access to health services.</p> <p>3. Objection to provision of edge of village sports facilities.</p>	<p>1. These issues are covered in the PFSB but the final paragraph suggested by Natural England is included as para 8.5.14</p> <p>2. Site allocated in SA 2 for Medical Centre.</p> <p>3. Removed objective of providing large sports facility on the outskirts of the Parish.</p>

Section 7: Policies and proposals: Economy.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. More detail on retail provision</p> <p>2. Public Parking – current and future provision.</p> <p>3. Concern about impact of tourism on Cannock Chase.</p> <p>4. Concern about flooding and design of area opposite Gt. Haywood canal junction.</p>	<p>1. In the absence of specific sites the wording of CTR1 was changed to widen the scope for sustainable development.</p> <p>2. CTR 1 wording changed to allow for exploitation of opportunities to provide car parking when development takes place. Flexible parking arrangement introduced on site SA1 which should alleviate problems with longer term parking. A requirement for parking provision inserted in CLE 6 for new tourist development.</p>

	<p>3. Insertion of advice in 8.2.17 about development around Cannock Chase SAC.</p> <p>4. Insertion of requirements in SA 1 to demonstrate that flooding risks have been addressed and that the AONB is respected.</p>
--	--

Transport. 7.3

Summary of comments:	1.	Modifications made:
<p>1. Pressure for improved public transport.</p> <p>2. Poor link between objective and policy on parking.</p> <p>3. Unreasonable for Plan to address school parking issues.</p> <p>4. Traffic figures questionable.</p> <p>5. Should include technology to support electric vehicles.</p> <p>6. Non-land use issues in policy CTR 2.</p> <p>7. Quiet Lanes not supported.</p> <p>8. No recognition of health benefits of walking.</p> <p>9. No mention of equestrian routes.</p>		<p>1. Paragraphs relating to present bus service moved to Section 3 and subject of improved public transport added to the aspirations in Appendix D.</p> <p>2. Reworded Policy CTR 1 to provide closer link to objective f.</p> <p>3. Included school run parking in aspirations in Appendix D.</p> <p>4. Removed traffic figures from 8.3.8.</p> <p>5. Made policy to support technology more general.</p> <p>6. Removed non-land use issues from CTR 2 and added general support for new technologies</p> <p>7. Removed Quiet Lanes without attempt at other management issues as recent planning permissions have removed such options.</p> <p>8. Add reference to health benefits in para 8.3.19.</p> <p>9. Add reference to equestrian Routes and the Sabrina Way in 8.3.21 and use of Community Paths Initiative to Appendix D.</p>

Communities

Housing requirement.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. Concern about the amount of development.</p> <p>2. Support for methodology.</p> <p>3. Points made about unequal development in the two KSVs.</p> <p>4. Transient nature of housing figures.</p>	<p>1. Updated 8.4.7 – 8.4.9 to show latest housing requirement that inform the Plan</p> <p>3. Para 8.4.7 includes explanation of unequal development in the two KSVs.</p> <p>4. Housing figures updates to show basis for allocations in Plan</p>

Housing capacity.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. Infrastructure not there to support further development.</p>	<p>1. Plan addresses infrastructure deficiencies in Policies CI 1 to CI 5.</p>

Settlements.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Include Roseacre in Settlement Boundary.2. Settlement zone includes new developments.3. Strong support for keeping settlements separate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Roseacre Site included in Settlement Boundary and allocated for Medical Centre2. and 3. Separation zone maps 8 and 9 redrawn.

Housing attributes.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No definition of local connection.2. Concern about restrictions on housing type in Policy CC3.3. Criticism of plans for play area provision.4. Comments on effect of HS2.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Inserted Appendix J to define local connection.2. Removed % figure from Policy CC3 to allow more flexibility3. Remove reference to 'equipped' play areas so as not to clash with SBC policy.4. HS 2 to be dealt with when the Plan is revised.

Environment. 7.5

Summary of comments:	2.	Modifications made:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Support for Policy CE1.2. Lack of consideration for the historic environment.3. Call for designations at Zion Chapel.4. Complaint about unjustified inclusion of areas on The Butts as Local Green Space5. Call for Marlborough Close land to be designated as Local Green Space.6. Limited references to SAC duplicates PFSB policies.7. No reference to watercourses and Humber River Basin.8. Lack of information about Green Infrastructure Plan.9. Duplication of PFSB policy N9 by Policy CE7.10. Lack of information on J.R.R. Tolkien connection.11. References to wind turbines conflicts with PFSB policy and not compatible with new government guidance.12. Lack of clarity in relation to Historic Highways in CE9.(Now CE 8)13. Suggested improvements to Policy CE 10 (Now CE 9)		<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Note support.2. Added paragraph c and f to CE 2 to support important views and the stream and river environment. Included support for Article 4 directive in para 8.5.17. (Historic environment covered well in PFSB and Conservation Area Appraisals)3. Consideration of Zion Chapel site included in Appendix D as an aspiration. (Local Green Space designation would cause the building itself to decay further).4. Further information added to support the section on Local Green Space. Removal of statements based on anecdotal evidence.5. Marlborough Close land designated as Local Green Space. Map 23.6. Para on SAC following Policy CE5 deleted.7. Rivers and streams added to policy CE6 and Humber River Basin management Plan referenced in new para 8.5.28. This supplement support in PFSB Policy N4.8. Added paragraph 8.5.32 about Green Infrastructure Plan.9. Deleted Policy CE710. Map and description included in association with Policy CLE 6 on tourism and reference made in new paragraph 8.5.35.11. Introduced new para 8.5.36 to give support to wind farms that contribute to the community.

	<p>12. Examples of Historic Highways given in 8.5.37 to support policy CE 8.</p> <p>13. Broaden treatment of the canal environment in Policy CE9 and add Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal reference.</p>
--	--

Infrastructure. 7.6

Summary of comments:	3.	Modifications made:
<p>1. Concern that the infrastructure will not cope with new development.</p> <p>2. Need for new surgery</p> <p>3. Need reference to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems(SUDS) in relation to flooding</p> <p>4. Circumstances surrounding sewerage capacity need explanation.</p> <p>5. Problem with access to proposed Burial site.</p> <p>6. Challenges to costs shown in Table 2.</p>		<p>1. Earmarked CiL funding to address highways' deficiencies in Table 2. Para 8.6.11 introduced to add support for local schools.</p> <p>2. Site allocated for new Medical Centre in SA2.</p> <p>3. Included SUDS requirements in Policy CI 3.</p> <p>4. Clarified in para 8.6.16 that sewerage system problems may delay, not stop, development.</p> <p>5. Acknowledge highways issue in para 8.6.24 but site kept in the Plan as the best option. Some CiL money earmarked in Table 2.</p> <p>6. Para 8.6.27 explains that these figures are very speculative but are designed to show how the Plan seeks to address community issues.</p>

Sustainable Development

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. Sustainable development appraisal table is proper to Basic Conditions Statement.</p>	<p>1. Table moved to Basic Conditions Statement.</p>

Proposals map.

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. Suggest that the whole plan be put on one map.</p>	<p>1. Insert folded A3 Map.</p>

Executive summary

Summary of comments:	Modifications made:
<p>1. Suggest that the summary is moved to the start of the document and includes AONB.</p>	<p>1. Summary moved and reference to AONB added.</p>

Appendices and other comments.

Comments included additions to glossary, individual views on various traffic problems, weeds and queries about changes from previous versions of the Plan.

Appendix 1: Reports of consultative meetings and events.

Report on the Neighbourhood Plan meeting with Colwich Walking Group.

6th May 2013.

About 22 people walked along the canal towpath and back and then assembled in the Red Lion for tea/coffee and toast.

The Neighbourhood Plan was explained to the group and they were asked to put forward the things that they considered as issues.

Obviously the canal was an issue raised early on with people saying that groups of boaters gathering on the canal, sometimes lighting fires, were intimidating. The problem was mostly down to longer term mooring rather than tourists.

Dog mess was an issue, especially on the Chase. There was a suggestion that corrals be set up near Chase car parks where dogs could be let loose to defecate before going on a walk.

An option with HS2 was to provide a belt of woodland along the route both as an amenity and to screen the track from residents.

A need for low cost housing was identified for both older people and for starter homes. The Forge in Great Haywood was put forward as a good example of older peoples' accommodation. There was a recognition that such housing needed to be close to transport and other facilities and be for people from the Parish.

Traffic through the parish was bad and more traffic calming was suggested.

It was suggested that the bus service time table could be reviewed. There was also a lack of car parking although there was a suggestion that an official agreement could be set up between the Memorial Hall and the doctors to use the hall car park.

There was a suggestion that the Doctors' Surgery wasn't adequate for the needs of a growing parish. Especially now that outline planning permission has been granted for more houses in Great Haywood.

Some of the discussion centred around The Elms in Great Haywood where small businesses were being moved out and there was nowhere else for them to go. There was some nervousness about the future of the Post Office in Great Haywood.

Residents also remarked about the loss of the police post in this area and a need for a greater police presence.

J. Blount

Notes of the meeting with Colwich Parish Councillors to discuss business issues in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan held on Tuesday 25th June 2013 at the Parish Centre, St. Mary's Road, Little Haywood.

PRESENT: Cllr. Paul Gilbert, Cllr. Amyas Stafford Northcote (representing St. Bede's Preparatory School), Cllr. Andy Cooper, Mr. Chris Boston, Mrs. Susan Grimes and Mr. John Blount.

1. Introductions. The Chairman, Cllr. Gilbert, welcomed everyone and introduced the members of the Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Team.

2. Brief outline of the Neighbourhood Plan and progress to date.

John Blount explained the progress on the plan and the issues raised in the early consultation.

These early responses would inform a parish wide survey which would guide the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. He said that a number of issues had been raised by the business questionnaire and by Census data relating to economic activity in the parish.

3. Exploration of business issues in Colwich parish.

There was some discussion about the lack of an 'account manager' figure to act as a conduit between developers and local authority staff. This extends to the Utilities where the procedures are not explained. These issues are particularly important at the start of the development as costs need to be established early on.

Managers of infrastructure could pay more attention to managing the environment.

Signage to draw people in to business sites would be useful over and above that provided by the brown tourist signs.

It was pointed out that typically 70% of customers live within 15 minutes drive time of businesses.

Discussions about canals revealed that there were no actually residential moorings around Gt. Haywood but many boaters 'cruised' between local sites and were virtually residents.

The Trent & Mersey and Staffordshire & Worcester canal junction was said to be the second busiest canal junction. Boat capacity, as calculated by the Canals and Rivers Trust, depended upon the water capacity.

It was agreed that a link to the Canal Side Farm web site from the Council's web site would be helpful and the farm shop would also act as a distribution point for Walk Leaflet Packs. There is an issue with charging because currently the Post Office sells Walk Leaflet Packs for the Council. There is quite a large stock of Walk Leaflet Packs but these are getting quite old.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their contribution.

Notes of the meeting between Colwich Parish Councillors and landowners to discuss development land in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan held on Monday 24th June 2013 at the Parish Centre, St. Mary's Road, Little Haywood.

PRESENT: Cllr. Mrs. Sylvia Gibson, Cllr. John Mosley, Cllr. Andrew Carrington, Cllr. Paul Gilbert, Mrs. Jan Reid, Mr. Mike Deavall, Mr. Brian Starbuck, Mrs. Nicky Wassall, Mr. Russell Crow, Mrs. Susan Grimes and Mr. John Blount.

1. Introductions. The Chairman, Cllr. Gilbert, welcomed everyone and introduced the members of the Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Team.

2. Brief outline of the Neighbourhood Plan and progress to date.

John Blount explained the progress on the plan and the issues raised in the early consultation.

These early responses would inform a parish wide survey which would guide the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. He said that some residents saw a need for lower cost housing for young people. He postulated that the Borough Council's figures for housing in the 10 key service villages would amount to about 3 houses a year for the next 18 years in Colwich parish.

3. Exploration of land use issues in Colwich parish.

There was a question about how the allocation for housing in Key Service Villages might actually be done. Various scenarios were explored but even the existence of Key Service Villages in the parish was put in doubt by the closure of local shops and pubs. There was also the removal of some small businesses from Gt. Haywood leaving land suitable, it was suggested, for car parking.

The opportunities for new employment areas were touched on.

Mr. Crow was asked about the viability of the site on the 'racecourse' given the HS2 route but said that it was too early to speculate about the actual line of the track. The problems with drainage, sewage and overhead power lines were pointed out to him.

There was a wide ranging discussion about what development would fund what facilities and how development, facilities and infrastructure should be phased.

The provision of a new health centre on the land next to Greenacres with sports fields beyond that would be a good option and this might be funded, at least in part, by money from sources other than developers.

There was a need for low cost housing but it was agreed that mixed provision did not work. It was hoped that the Borough Council would come up with some helpful policies on the Community Infrastructure Levy and the New Homes Bonus that might help the Council take a more 'hands-on' approach to housing provision in the parish.

Stafford & Rural Homes' policy of buying up houses for use by people who were not local was not helpful to the less well off people in the parish.

The land to the North East of Gt. Haywood was looked at and note was taken about accessibility and the danger of development there forming part of a link to Lt. Haywood. Land opposite Canal Side Farm was touched on with mention of previous talk of a hotel on the site.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their contribution.

Notes of the meeting with Colwich Parish Councillors to discuss development proposals in connection with the Neighbourhood Plan held on Monday 17th June 2013 at the Parish Centre, St. Mary's Road, Little Haywood.

PRESENT: Cllr. Mrs. Sylvia Gibson, Mrs. Susan Pope, Mr. Michael Pope, Mr. Robert Mills (Les Stephan Planning), Mr. Desmond Sluce (Les Stephan Planning), Mr. Les Stephan, Mr. Noel Hawley, (Moore Family Trust), Mr. Anthony Phillips (acting for Moore Family Trust), Mike Timmins (St. Modwen), Cllr. John Mosley, Cllr. Andrew Carrington, Cllr. Paul Gilbert, Mr. Habib Ibrahim, Mr. Michael Ibrahim, Mrs. Susan Grimes and Mr. John Blount.

1. Introductions. The Chairman, Cllr. Gilbert, welcomed everyone and introduced the members of the Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Team.

2. Brief outline of the Neighbourhood Plan and progress to date.

John Blount explained the progress on the plan and the issues raised in the early consultation.

These early responses would inform a parish wide survey which would guide the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. He said that some residents saw a need for lower cost housing for young people. He postulated that the Borough Council's figures for housing in the 10 key service villages would amount to about 3 houses a year for the next 18 years in Colwich parish.

3. Exploration of how development proposals might benefit Colwich parish.

A Developer said that he agreed with the Borough Council's spatial vision and the future growth methodology. He suggested that too much housing development was being put into Stafford and that past growth rates should be used as these were more realistic. [35% between 2001 and 2012 as against 20% proposed for rural areas in Stafford's draft plan].

The Developers opposed setting pre-determined development boundaries as these were said to be arbitrary and limited flexibility.

Les Stephan distributed papers and plans relating to proposed development between Great and Little Haywood saying that the access from Main Road to the first phase of the site and access to the A51 for later development would not be a problem. [No details have been discussed with the Highways Authority]. The first phase would see about 200 houses built around the Shenley Cottage site. Subsequent phases of the development would satisfy the need for more employment in the parish.

Councillors queried the phasing of the infrastructure pointing out that the sewage infrastructure in particular was fragile. The Developer said that services would be put in place first but pointed out that sales of houses were needed to fund such things as a new health centre

The role of Stafford and Rural Homes was questioned as it appeared that they were removing houses from the local housing stock to use for people from outside the area. The use of a percentage to determine the mix of affordable and market housing was felt to be undesirable. It was suggested that low cost housing (20% below typical market prices) was one answer to the problem. Another was to have an affordable housing levy on market price housing that could fund affordable housing at a separate location.

Michael Pope said that he represented people with land to the east of, and adjacent to, that on the Les Stephan plan. He introduced Dr. Abib Ibrahim, a local GP, who had land off the A51 just north of Colwich Service Station. Dr. Ibrahim and his son talked about the

provision of a range of facilities that could be provided for elderly people or people with learning difficulties. These could include 'extra-care' facilities or medical facilities. Not only would this provide facilities but it would also provide reasonably paid employment. This could be privately funded. The present access to the 3 acre site could be widened to take 2-way traffic and the potential for flooding on the site could be addressed.

Mike Timmins said that St. Modwen had bought 2.32 acres of land between Coley Lane and the A51 in the 90s and had built a small development of 5 houses served by a service road. Although there were no immediate plans to develop the site there was access to the remainder of the site and this would provide about 20 houses. This land included a footpath that was not a right of way but which would not be disturbed.

A key threat from developers was the lack of an identified 5 year land supply within Stafford Borough. There should also be a 20% provisional allowance on top of this.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their contribution.

Minutes of the meeting of Colwich Parish Councillors with Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit held on 11th June 2013 at the Parish Centre, Little Haywood.

Present: Cllr. Mrs. Tabernor, Colwich Parish Council, Mr. G. Corbett-Marshall, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, Mr. C. Keble, Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit and J. Blount, Colwich Neighbourhood Plan.

1. Introductions. Mr. Blount made the introductions.

2. Outline of the Neighbourhood Plan and progress to date. Mr. Blount explained that the Neighbourhood Plan area had been agreed by the Borough Council and that the Neighbourhood Plan was well advanced with consulting on the issues. He presented those present with an analysis of responses to questionnaires from two Community Engagement Events.

3. Exploration of how the three organisations might collaborate to further their aims. There was a discussion about the pressures on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the possible modification of the buffer areas proposed in policy N6 of the Borough Council's pre-submission Local Plan and the scope for Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS).

It was pointed out that the buffer area referred to the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) not the AONB. There is talk of four SANGS areas around the SAC but the idea is very new. It might be possible for a farmer to make land available but this would probably be as part of a development deal.

The threats and opportunities posed by HS2 were discussed. The planning officer at Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (SWT) was spending a great deal of time on this issue. The line of the track could be treated in much the same way as a by-pass either forming a boundary for development or providing isolated areas that could be used for environmental benefit. The embankments could be fashioned to improve views and landscape quality as well as providing wildlife areas.

The existing classified areas were discussed. It was not felt that small developments of a few houses adjacent to the AONB posed much of a threat.

There was a problem in strengthening environmental policies in that policies needed to be positively worded. A policy that stated that anything that disturbed an orchid site would not be allowed was unlikely to find acceptance. Policies that supported that supported the existing wildlife sites in the parish were important.

The possibility of an earlier completion of the Neighbourhood Plan was discussed. The Local Plan was felt to be quite sound and close working with the Borough Council could ensure that there was no conflict. There was no guarantee that the Local Plan would be acceptable though.

The questionnaire analysis was examined and the importance of maintaining gaps between settlements was highlighted. Developments to cater for elderly people were suggested as has been provided in the 63 apartment extra-care scheme at Madeley. A response to the AONB management plan consultation was encouraged – this was due to finish on 14th June. [This was done on 12th June mentioning the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan in connection with future community involvement and the economy of the AONB.]

J. Blount.

Notes on meeting with the Guides 14th May 2013 at Colwich Community Centre

Co-ordinator Alison Flower 07753304583

Administrator Annabelle Davys 01889 882855

Guides 8yrs – 15yrs

After introducing myself, and explaining what a Neighbourhood Plan was I gave the Guides a few minutes to think about their community.

The following came out of our discussion.

1. The play area on St Mary's estate needs some more play equipment on it.
2. The same area could do with some social covered seating for people to sit and chat.
3. One of the Guides thought the shop in Little Haywood was going to close. She hoped it wasn't because she liked the shop.
4. One Guide wanted a play area in Colwich, but wasn't sure where it could be sited.
5. Situated on Kingfisher Drive is a small grassed area. It was suggested that a couple of pieces of play equipment and some social seating could fit on this area.

Generally the Guides thought they had enough to occupy them at the Guide meetings. Their diary is packed full of activities for the following year. Inside activities during the winter months, and outdoor activities during the summer.

Sue Grimes

Notes on meeting with Voluntary Transport Group

12/7/2013

The meeting was attended by 18 members of the Voluntary Transport Group. Consisting of the secretary, treasurer, co-ordinators and drivers. The Chairperson sent her apologise and was unable to attend the meeting.

After the business of the Voluntary Transport Group, I introduced myself and explained what a Neighbourhood Plan was. Some members already understood the concept of a N.P. and had followed its progress with interest. Others found the plan a new experience.

The following points were raised.

1. Colwich Parish was a very pleasant place to live.
2. It provided a good rural atmosphere with plenty of places to enjoy the countryside.
3. Having a doctors, dentist, pubs, schools, and shops locally was a bonus. This all added to the enjoyment of living in this area.
4. Because most of the group was dedicated to providing Volunteer Transport most of the comments raised centred on reasons for this groups existence.
 - a. The bus service did not enable people to get to hospitals, (Stafford, Cannock, Newcross), doctors surgeries or local town centres.
 - b. People with poor or no sight were excluded from reading any local news without help from a sighted person or a talking tape.
 - c. Some of the elderly would like a central phone number to contact, so they can be directed towards help with form filling, odd jobs around the house, and translating paperwork.
5. Problems with parking at the doctors was raised. The doctors overall gave a good service.
6. Provision of a bowling green and tennis courts would enable older people to enjoy a social and leisure past time.
7. It was asked why the telephone exchange in Little Haywood wasn't used as a Car Park. Some members were under the impression that the telephone exchange was out of commission.

Sue Grimes

Notes from the meeting with Mother and Toddlers Group. Thurs. May 16th

Contact: Emma Owen 01889 808237

After spending a short time looking at the plan of Colwich Parish area, a discussion took place about what the young families wanted from their community.

Everyone was pleased with the location of the Haywoods and Colwich. Shugborough, the canal system and the river provided good recreation facilities. The schools and shops were very good.

However the following points were raised to aid improvement to the area.

8. Access to buildings with pushchairs and wheelchairs was very often a problem because of steps and uneven doorways.
9. Play equipment on play areas needs updating.
10. A MUGA and skate park would be a good idea on the Jubilee Playing Field.
11. More Parking is needed at the doctors surgery and schools.
12. A Pedestrian Crossing by Roseacre at Gt Haywood would enable safer access to the opposite footway, rather than trying to cross by the mini Island which is very hazardous.
13. There was a worry that more housing would put a strain on local amenities. Especially the doctor's surgery.
14. It was thought that a small number of affordable houses/flats could be scattered around the Parish.
15. Now that the Roseacre site has outline planning permission, will a play area be incorporated on the housing plan?
16. There was concern that the industrial site at the rear of The Clifford was becoming an eyesore because it needed looking after and cared for.

Sue Grimes

Notes on meeting with the Rangers 12th May 2013 at Colwich Parish Centre.

After introducing myself and explaining what a Neighbourhood Plan is, the Rangers engaged into a very lively discussion about the future of Colwich Parish.

Helen Jenkinson was the adult leader of the Ranger group which consisted of several 16yr plus students.

The following are points that were raised by the Rangers.

17. Affordable housing should be considered in future developments for young and older people. With a stipulation that local people should have first refusal with these properties.
18. A skate park could be placed to the rear of the Jubilee Playing Fields along with a MUGA.
19. Social seating with a cover could be located outside Gt Haywood shops, on the green space by the notice board. Also social seating could replace the old bench opposite the Spa shop in Gt. Haywood.
20. The young people were concerned that the shops and businesses were closing, especially near the Clifford Arms, and that they would be excluded from getting local work.
21. This problem led the conversation onto the poor bus service that existed through the villages. Could the bus service company be asked for a later service. Currently the buses stop at 6.00 pm. This is no good for evening entertainment.
22. There was a great concern regarding the morning bus services. Very often the 7.50 am bus DOES NOT stop to pick people up because it is full. Could the bus service put on two buses at this time? The students need to get to college and school and

not be late. This problem exists from September – March when new courses start. This could get more of a problem now that students have to stay at school for another year.

7. Concern was raised about safety along unlit roads. Some street lighting has been switched off. Along one road on the Uplands Estate there is no lighting at all.
8. Could speed cameras be placed near the Toldish Lane, Main Road junction on the A51? Similar to the 40 mph area at Colwich.
9. The presence of a PC would make people feel safer, and could also monitor the poor parking along many of the roads especially those who park too close to peoples drives causing obstructions.
10. One Ranger wondered why there were signs in place at Gt Haywood for people to look out for DUCKS but not for WATCH YOUR SPEED. Surely they cost the same.

Finally, I observed that it was evident that young people, and many adults do not know how local councils work.

Could an article be placed in the Newsletter explaining what the County Council and the Borough Council are there to do.

More importantly some of the Rangers said they did not know what the Parish Council did, that members of the public could attend the meetings, and also raise any issues they might have at public participation time.

Helen Jenkinson said she would like to bring her Rangers to a Parish Council meeting to see how it works. Could she be told when the meetings are?

Sue Grimes

Report on Community Engagement Event at Gt. Haywood Memorial Hall. **13th April 2013.**

This event was well attended with many residents engaging in discussions about the plan. Residents were encouraged to fill in slips designed to give information about their feelings and concerns about the parish and 72 did so.



The slips asked 4 questions: Which community do you live in; what do you like about the area?; what don't you like about the area? and What are the main problems in the area?

A rough analysis of these slips has been carried out for this report.

There were 42 slips from Gt. Haywood, 24 from Lt. Haywood, 4 from Colwich and 2 from Wolseley Bridge.

Overwhelmingly the thing that people liked was the friendliness of the place although a few people from

Lt. Haywood said that there was a lack of a sense of community. The next most popular reason was the quietness of the place. Many people also remarked on the lovely countryside and the rural aspect of the place.

The things that people didn't like were mixed up with the problems that were reported. The biggest issue was cheaper housing, whether it was affordable housing, smaller units or sheltered accommodation. Many remarked on the lack of housing for younger people. Poor bus services and travel facilities generally attracted a lot of comment. Predictably HS2 was a concern to many. A lot of residents felt that dogs were a problem. Across the parish, but especially in Lt. Haywood, parking was seen as a problem. It was often tied in with the surgery where many felt that there was a need for better health services. Gt. Haywood residents were alone in being concerned about the flood plain. Lt. Haywood residents were concerned about the need for better play/youth facilities although they were not alone – there was support from Gt. Haywood as well.

The discussions with residents often centred on particular sites and comments were made about problems with access and other issues. An oft repeated view was the need to keep the villages separate and avoid developing to the east of the A51. Facilities for visitor moorings were preferred to residential moorings. Many comments reflected the views given on the slips but there was a wealth of information not reflected in this short note.

A more thorough analysis of the comments and slips will take place either in the Parish Centre or by the author as determined by Colwich Parish Council.

John Blount

Report on Community Engagement Event at Colwich and Little Haywood Village Hall on 1st June 2013.

This event took place over the 6 hours preceding the Parish Meeting. There was a constant flow of residents calling to find out more about the Neighbourhood Plan.

This followed a similar event in April where residents were encouraged to fill in slips designed to give information about their feelings and concerns about the parish. 87 slips were submitted.

The slips asked 4 questions: Which community do you live in; what do you like about the area?; what don't you like about the area? and What are the main problems in the area?

An analysis of these slips has been carried out for this report.

There were 21 slips from Gt. Haywood, 54 from Lt. Haywood, 5 from Colwich and 9 from other areas.

There was also a great deal of discussion about the issues facing the parish – mainly the threat of development.



The responses were more to do with the environment than the previous time. Residents valued the peace and quiet of their place as well as the sense of community. The rural aspect and the natural environment were mentioned by many people. Residents appreciated being able to go for walks in the locality and mentioned the closeness of Cannock Chase, the river and the canals. As before people mentioned the friendliness of the place although to a lesser extent than previously. (Gt. Haywood seems to be the most friendly place).

As before the things that people didn't like were mixed up with the problems that were reported. The biggest issue was the threat of development. This was mainly concerned with additional housing but HS2 came in for some negative comments. A number of residents commented that Hixon and Rugeley could provide employment rather than it being provided within the parish. There was much more support for bus services than previously but not everyone was happy with the service.

Dogs were a problem – not only because people didn't clear up after them but because of the noise nuisance.

There was a wide range of highway related issues and speeding and excess traffic were mentioned by many residents. Parking came in for a lot of complaints and this was especially so at the surgery. The surgery was also felt to be overstretched as were the schools.

Unlike the last consultation there were as many complaints about flooding from Lt. Haywood residents as there were from Gt. Haywood. The inadequate sewerage system also attracted comments.

The discussions with residents often centred on particular sites and comments were made about problems with access and other issues. Many residents stressed the need to keep the villages separate; not only Gt. Haywood and Lt. Haywood/Colwich but also Wolseley Bridge and Rugeley. The relative lack of interest from Colwich needs to be addressed in future consultation.

The Parish Meeting included a presentation about the Neighbourhood Plan to about 50 residents.

John Blount



Report on Community Engagement Event at Gt. Haywood Memorial Hall on 15th August 2013.

This event coincided with the Consultation by Stafford Borough Council on both the Gt. Haywood and Shugborough Conservation Area and the Lt. Haywood and Colwich Conservation Area.

The opportunity had been taken to introduce the Colwich Village Design Statement into the presentations on the Neighbourhood Plan. The Village Design Statement is a valuable document that was produced by a group of residents allied with The Haywoods Society. It is an update and extension of an earlier document. Both had been extensively consulted on. The most recent one follows accepted guidance and is part of Stafford Borough Council's Forward Planning Evidence Base.

Many of the people attending this event had already been to previous events so their views were well known however the introduction of the Village Design Statement attracted a lot of positive comment. The desire to preserve what was good about Colwich Parish led to many comments to the Stafford Borough Council officers who were open to suggestions for improving the draft Conservation Area proposals.



Fears of over development were expressed and a keen desire to preserve Shenley Cottage and the historic fields patterns and unimproved grasslands behind it. The removal of canal related areas raised some concern but it was explained that this was to enable them to be properly incorporated into revised Conservation Areas for the Staffordshire and Worcester Canal and the Trent and Mersey Canal. Unfortunately these are unlikely to be completed in time for the Neighbourhood Plan to acknowledge them.

John Blount



Colwich and Little Great Haywood Conservation Area Appraisal

An opportunity to comment on the results of the Colwich and Little
Haywood Conservation Area appraisal and Proposed Boundary Revisions.



Public Consultation Exhibition, The Memorial Hall, Great
Haywood. Thursday 15 September 2013 from 6pm-8pm.

There will also be a chance to talk to Councillors about the
COLWICH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
and give your views on the
VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT.

Report on the Neighbourhood Plan meeting with schoolchildren at Weston Road Academy. 18th September 2013.

The principle of Weston Road Academy, Dr. Taylor, had kindly arranged for us to interview some of the Colwich schoolchildren during their break.

On arrival we were welcomed by the Deputy Principle, Mr. Dan Moore, who took us to the conference room. Four female pupils were waiting to talk to us.

Cllr. Mrs. Sue Grimes and I introduced ourselves and we explained the function of the Parish Council and the opportunity provided by the Neighbourhood Plan.

Cllr. Mrs. Grimes had produced a draft questionnaire based on the Eccleshall model but modified in the light of decisions made at the last Neighbourhood Plan Committee meeting

The pupils felt that the questions were all suitable but that more space should be left for answers; especially for question 4.

With the help of Mr. Moore we explored the issues of the need to travel to facilities and the public transport facilities available to them. The lack of a Youth Club was mentioned and also the lack of any covered area to hang out.

They considered that prizes of £75, £50 and £25 were suitable inducements to encourage them to fill in the questionnaires. Maps might be useful with possibly some suggestions for sites.

We said that we would have to wait for a decision of the Parish Council but that we expected the questionnaire to be available in a few weeks. We agreed to notify the school when the questionnaires were available.

An on-line facility for completing the questionnaire is being investigated.

J. Blount

Report on Community Engagement weekend 3/4th May 2014.

A full colour 4 page leaflet was delivered to all residents over the Easter period. The leaflet gave residents key facts about the issues in the Parish, summarised the responses in the questionnaires they had completed and indicated the objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan in response. The leaflet advertised two daytime Community Engagement events and the evening Parish Meeting which featured the Neighbourhood Plan.

The quality of the leaflet won praise from a number of residents but attendance at the event was disappointing.

Younger residents gathered around the two representatives from Wicksteed Leisure to discuss play equipment proposals.

At both the Saturday and the, rather busier, Sunday session residents who did visit engaged in wide ranging discussions although these were often based around recent planning applications rather than looking further forward. None of the issues raised came as a surprise so we drew comfort from that.

It was not possible to take notes and engage in discussion at the same time so residents were asked to put their thoughts and ideas down on one of the leaflet return forms provided.

Only twenty four forms were returned. Nobody disagreed with the Vision statement. Seventeen objectives were scored with a 'No' although this reduces to two if one individual's responses are ignored.

It is difficult to draw conclusions from the response forms. Every objective gained a lot of support with only the idea of having a large sports area drawing anything more than one negative comment. We seem to have our objectives about right although there is a nervousness about development overtaking Plan production.

The Parish Assembly on Saturday evening was positive overall but peppered with comments and questions that cast doubt on the integrity of the Council.

In spite of offering three substantial prizes in a draw the Youth Survey only attracted twenty five entries. Six of those were difficult to analyse as the on-line survey did not show individual returns.

- 10 were from girls,
- 9 were from 11-12 year olds,
- 11 were from 13-15 year olds,
- 2 from a 16-17 year old,
- 12 said that they felt part of the parish,
- 14 said that they were happy with existing outdoor areas,
- 7 said that they were happy with existing sport,
- 5 said that they were happy with existing groups/clubs,
- 16 want a say on local issues,
- 8 use Rugeley Leisure Centre,
- 8 use Stafford Leisure Centre.

The number one improvement was for more sports.

It was always the case that some information would do more to inform projects than the Neighbourhood Plan and this is the case with the Youth Survey.

J. Blount.

Colwich School Christmas Fair 2014.



As usual this was well attended and many people stopped to chat. It appears that the County Council are really serious about ending their lease of Shugborough early. The staff have been reduced already and staff briefings are taking place about the future.

There is said to be the remains of a Roman granary near The Butts.

The geology of The Butts was explained to me. Beneath the layer of loam is a layer of marl about 1m thick and beneath this is sandstone. Blind newts are said to inhabit the marl layer but no reference to blind newts in the UK can be found. Newts serve as bioindicators because of their thin, sensitive skin and evidence of their presence (or absence) can serve as an indicator of the health of the environment. Most species are highly sensitive to subtle changes in the PH level of streams and lakes they live in.

Puncturing the marl layer allows water to run through into the sandstone layer and muddies the water in the large well at, what was, The Knot public house.

The developers on the site to the east of The Ring have already carried out drilling operations and the householder has complained to the Environment Agency. It is said that water running through into the sandstone could destabilise it. Suds systems work for a few months until they get blocked by silica and cease to function.

A resident of Hawkmore Drive said that for 11 years after he moved in there was local flooding. It ceased after he had removed a large amount of topsoil to landscape his garden.

John Blount

REACHING OUT TO CHILDREN IN THE PARISH

The decision to conduct a pupil-based survey

The Neighbourhood Planning Committee is on the continuous quest of seeking information so that we can bring about change, if change is deemed to be necessary. With this in mind, it was decided to focus on one hard-to-reach group - children who go to one of the local primary schools - to establish the nature of any views the pupils may have about the future of their parish.

Engagement techniques

Different Neighbourhood Planning groups are using a range of methods to engage younger generations in the Neighbourhood Planning process. The strategy that was chosen was asking the opinions of schoolchildren at sessions held at local primary schools. One of the Councillors on the Neighbourhood Planning Committee is also an after-school club teacher in two out of the three primary schools. She felt that she had the trust of these pupils, as she had known them for five months when the survey was conducted

School-based question and answer sessions

Councillor Gibson, referred to above, actively engaged with pupils during one of their normal sessions - an after school German Club. The pupils were aged between 8 and 11. Pupils were asked to answer four questions:

23. What do you like about your village?
24. What don't you like about your village?
25. Is there anything that you would like to see in your village that isn't there now?
26. Is there anything that exists in your village, which you would like to get rid of?

What came out of the survey?

Pupils seemed very pleased that they lived in a small and contained community with lots of green space, which contained interesting wildlife. They appreciated the fact that they lived in a peaceful environment. Many of them felt that there were not enough play areas for their age group and near to where they live - particularly the ones that live on one of our small estates. They are the 'in-betweeners' - not old enough to go far from home to play and yet dissatisfied with the play equipment available to them as it is for much younger children and, very often, has been vandalised.

S. Gibson

SURVEY RESULTS

	What do you like about your village?	What don't you like about your village?	Is there anything that you would like to see in your village that isn't there now?	Is there anything that exists in your village which you would like to get rid of!
A1	It's small and contained	There aren't enough play areas for our age group (8 - 11 yrs old) There are two play areas but if you don't live near either of those, it's tough		no
S1	That there's a play area near to where I live. I have lots of friends here.			
M1	I like the fact that there's lots of space that you can play around in (Molly lives on a farm) There's lots of friendly people	There aren't many green areas on the estates and the play equipment is for really young people		
A2	All the wildlife and Shugborough	I don't like kids smoking in the Uplands	I want a theme park with a roller-coaster	No
S2	That the pavements in the Uplands get gritted	There are too many stones on the road	More trees in the village	No
E	It's peaceful. It's easy to ride my bike in the village	Teenagers from elsewhere come on their skateboards when I am riding my bike and I am frightened	Better play equipment (vandal-proof) in L.H .. I like the idea of only children from L.H. playing in L.H.	

M2	It's peaceful. Everybody knows everybody else	How people leave litter and dogpoo	I would like to see everyone working together to make it a nicer, happier place. Please keep the trees and plants healthy	
J	There are woods and stretches of water close by		More space to play football	
O	There's a lot of space and it doesn't get too busy			There are too many roads in our village

Child	What do you like about your village?	What don't you like about your village?	Is there anything that would like to see in your village would there now?	Is there anything exists in your village which you like to get rid of?
A1	A	H		
S1	B	0	0	
M1	B	H	0	
A2	C	I	M	
S2	D	J	N	
E	E	K	P	
M2	F	L	N	
J	G	0		
O	B	0		

9 children

Top answers

B=2 Space and play area nearby

H=2 Not enough play areas older children 8-11

N=2 More trees

Category of answer

- A= Small and contained
- B= Space and play area nearby
- C= Wildlife
- 0= Pavements are gritted
- E= Easy to ride a bike in the area
- F= Know everybody else
- G= Lots of countryside
- H= Not enough play areas older children 8-11
- 1= Kids smoking
- J= Too many stones in the road
- K= Teenagers from elsewhere come and frighten
- L= Litter and dog poo
- M= Theme park
- N= More trees
- P= Vandal proof play equipment
- Q= More space to play football**

Minutes of the meeting of Colwich Parish Councillors with Shugborough Estate held on 12th June 2013 at the Parish Centre, Little Haywood.

Present: Mr. S. Dodd, Shugborough Estate, Cllr. P. Gilbert, Cllr. A. Cooper, Mrs. S. Grimes and J. Blount.

1. Introductions. Mr. Blount introduced the members.

2. Brief outline of the Neighbourhood Plan and progress to date. Mr. Blount gave a resumé of the Neighbourhood Plan and where the Council were in the process. He explained that, as well as the statutory part of the plan, there would be a number of projects.

3. Exploration of opportunities for collaboration.

Mr. Dodd described the extent of the estate and its facilities.

The possibility of offices or workshops for residents to occupy was discussed but these were limited. Dairy Cottage had been vacated by the AONB Unit but parking was difficult. More promising was the possibility of using the land within an unused section of the walled garden as additional allotments for residents. There would be a lot of material to be cleared before the area could be brought into use.

The football and cricket areas are used by County Council staff but there was probably scope to expand this to residents. The pavilion on site was in poor condition and needed attention. It was felt that both the pavilion and the potential allotment area would attract grants as community projects.

The Education Centre had been handed over to Entrust - a joint venture with Capita to provide an extensive package of services from school improvement to ICT, ground maintenance and performing arts.

Early Neighbourhood Plan surveys had indicated the popularity of walking and the possibility of a walking route from Gt. Haywood to Lt. Haywood was discussed. Getting access on to the road at the Lt. Haywood end was not straightforward but was feasible. This is in the area under the control of the National Trust so needs to be discussed with them.

Fishing rights are currently being investigated by the Estate and the Council offered to help with publicising this and other opportunities.

Mr. Dodd told the meeting that they had signed an Environmental Stewardship Agreement with Natural England and this would involve more environmentally friendly management of the estate. He agreed to provide Mr. Blount with the contacts who could help further with some of the items raised.

It was recognised that the above chimed well with the policies in the County Council's Strategic Plan especially where it states that part of the County Council's role is in 'Providing opportunities for our communities to participate in recreational activities by developing partnerships to support the delivery of culture, sport and active recreation. Staffordshire has a unique, high quality natural environment, which is ideally suited for a range of outdoor pursuits'.

Cllr. Gilbert thanked Mr. Dodd for his help in examining how Shugborough and the Parish Council could better work together.

Notes on meeting with the Wednesday Club 15th May 2013 at Great Haywood Memorial Hall

Organiser Mrs. C. Dyble. 01889 882467

There were about 20 people in attendance. All female. Some I knew from Hixon.

I was introduced and explained that I had been asked to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. I talked about what a Neighbourhood Plan was, the area it covered and the timescale.

I started the consultation session off by saying there were things that they liked about their area and asked what these were.

This led to a lively and wide ranging discussion out of which came the following points:

27. That there is always plenty going on (in a social sense).

28. Shugborough and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust were appreciated because of the walks around the grounds.

I then moved on to issues/things that they would like to change. The following points were made:

29. Bus services were poor. It was not possible for people to go to the Wednesday Club using public transport. It was necessary to change at the Lamb and Flag to get to Rugeley and no bus shelters were available. Although the services were supposed to tie up the Rugeley bus was often late.

30. Parking was poor – especially at the doctors. The facility for the surgery staff to park behind the Memorial Hall was not used.

31. Affordable housing is needed for the kids.

32. Funding is needed for clubs and social activities. I encouraged them to apply to Cllr. Bloomer and the Parish Council for funding.

John Blount

Appendix 2: Community Survey Questionnaire.

Appendix 3: Youth survey.

Reward Vouchers

1st £75

2nd £50

3rd £25

COLWICH PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Young Peoples Survey

Are you between 11 -17 and live in the Haywoods, Colwich, Wolsley Bridge or Bishton?

We want **your** views on **your** future in Colwich Parish.

Fill in this form and qualify for the prize draw and/or come to Gt. Haywood Memorial Hall in the afternoon on 3rd May and talk about your needs.

1. Do you feel part of village life? ✓/x					
2. Are you happy with the following existing facilities?					
OUTDOOR AREAS	✓/x				
SPORT	✓/x				
GROUPS/CLUBS	✓/x				
3. Where do you go for other leisure activities?					
4. Do you want a say on local issues? ✓/x					
5. My Number 1 improvement for young people would be..... (eg. sports stuff, meeting places, facilities, etc.)					
About You – please circle		11-12yrs	13-15yrs	16-17yrs	Boy/Girl
Name/address					
(This is optional but is needed if you are to be entered into the draw for Reward Vouchers of your choice)					
<p>All information you give will be treated as confidential. Your answers will be used to create more facilities locally for young people. Please call 01889 882665 for more information.</p> <p>You can submit this information:</p> <p>On-line: http://questionpro.com/t/AKh8BZQWVm</p> <p>By email: scan this sheet and email to n.plan@colwich.staffslc.gov.uk</p> <p>By post: to Colwich Parish Council, Parish Centre, St. Mary's Rd, Lt. Haywood, Stafford. ST18 0NJ</p> <p>By hand: Between 12 noon and 7pm on 3rd May at Gt. Haywood Memorial Hall or between 2pm and 4pm on 4th May at the Parish Centre.</p> <p>The last day for submission is the 4th May 2014.</p>					

Appendix 4: Feedback leaflet.

Appendix 5: Notes of meetings with neighbouring councils.

Meeting between Brocton Parish Council and Colwich Parish Council.

A very useful meeting took place on Wednesday 23rd July 2014 at Brocton Village Hall between Cllr. Bob Mudway (Chairman) and Mrs. Christine Hammond (Clerk) of Brocton Parish Council and Cllr Paul Gilbert, Chairman of Colwich Parish Council, and John Blount, Neighbourhood Plan Consultant for Colwich.

Sharing a length of boundary across the western flank of Colwich Parish the Parish of Brocton is smaller in terms of population (1,082 in 2011 census) but covers a large area of Cannock Chase. Brocton felt that they had a very useful relationship with the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty(AONB) team and encouraged Colwich to take part.

Like Colwich there is an area of green space that physically divides the built up area of the Parish. As much of Brocton is in the AONB there seems little prospect of development except, perhaps, along the A34 towards Stafford where there is some housing and a small industrial estate.

Brocton has excellent play facilities for younger people but recreational facilities for older children and adults is lacking. The football club has been so successful that it has moved into Stafford. Cricket is no longer played in the village but Milford Cricket Club is doing great work with youngsters. Brocton Golf Club is a well used facility. Young Farmers are always looking for facilities and it was recommended that an approach be made to Staffordshire Council for Voluntary Services to explore this. Brocton's recent play provision survey showed that people come from quite a wide area to enjoy their play facilities. Overall Brocton would welcome the provision of adult recreational facilities in the area.

Bus services through the village only run once a day and efforts to improve this would be welcome.

Meeting between Brindley Heath Parish Council and Colwich Parish Council.

A very useful meeting took place on Thursday 17th July 2014 at Gt. Haywood Memorial Hall between Cllr. Paul Adams (Chairman) and Cllr. David Ballett from Brindley Heath Parish Council and Cllr Paul Gilbert, Chairman of Colwich Parish Council, and John Blount, Neighbourhood Plan Consultant for Colwich.

Sharing a length of boundary across the southern flank of Colwich Parish the Parish of Brindley Heath is quite small in terms of population (780 electors) but covers a large area of Cannock Chase. The whole of Brindley Heath Parish is in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty(AONB) and has many Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The boundary with Colwich goes through the quarry.

Brindley Heath is in Cannock District. This 2nd tier Council shares a number of functions with Stafford Borough Council and, like Stafford, they have just adopted their Local Plan.

There seems little prospect of further housing being built in Colwich Parish along Bower Lane but this is, in any case, not a great concern to Brindley Heath.

Although Brindley Heath is adjacent to Rugeley the recreational facilities are not good as the facilities at Rugeley Leisure Centre are largely taken up by school children. They would welcome facilities in Colwich Parish. Brindley Heath have no wish to have more development in their Parish. Housing would be very unlikely due to the AONB and the last County Council Waste and Minerals Plan came down against an extension of the quarry.

Heavy Commercial Vehicles from the quarry using Bower Lane give some problems and the current quarry management is unresponsive. There was some concern about HS2 sourcing aggregates from this quarry.

As with Colwich the Chase attracts a large number of visitors but the numbers are larger and concentrated at the Birches Valley Forest Centre and Marquise Drive Visitor Centre run by the County Council.

The Forest Centre at Brin? attracts a large number of bikers and these can be a danger to walkers. The focus of the Forestry Commission seems to be economic. They are not responsive to approaches by the Council and musical events held on Forestry land are much noisier than those at Shugborough. Similarly the AONB bureaucracy seems impervious to Parish Council approaches.

Trent Valley railway station is a useful facility for Brindley Heath residents especially since a local farmer has provided additional parking.

Brindley Heath Councillors supported the idea of taking steps to give local councils a larger voice both through engaging with local MPs and by working together with other Parish and Town Councils.

Meeting between Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council and Colwich Parish Council.

A very useful meeting took place on 30th May 2014 at Colwich Parish Centre between Cllr. Mrs. Anne Andrews, clerk and Councillor at Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council, Cllr. Tony Young, also of Ingestre with Tixall, Cllr Paul Gilbert, Chairman of Colwich Parish Council, and John Blount, Neighbourhood Plan Consultant for Colwich.

Sharing about a 4Km length of boundary across a key part of the west flank of Colwich the Parish of Ingestre with Tixall is quite small but shares the parish's usual road route to Stafford, the River Sow and the Staffs & Worcester canal as well as many services.

Although not under the same pressure as Colwich, developers have an eye on the fields either side of Tixall Road. Many of the houses in Ingestre with Tixall are rented. The parish shares a need for housing for young people and for people who wish to downsize. The Chairman offered to include their residents within the definition of 'local people' when drawing up plans for Colwich. There is concern about the school capacity to serve the Ingestre with Tixall children. Cllr. Mrs. Andrews and Cllr. Young were made aware of plans to provide a large sports facility in Colwich which would serve the needs of a wider community.

There are worries about commuter traffic as there are already frequent crashes on the bends on Tixall Road. Speeding is an issue. There is a great need for an eastern route around Stafford but the fragmented provision of highways infrastructure is unlikely to provide this.

Ingestre with Tixall obviously share the concerns about HS2 and feel that the present route will be the final one. Cement Works and steel fabricating units will be set up along the route and land near Ingestre crossroads is seen as a contender for this use.

Another problem common to both parishes is the practice of narrow boats 'continuously cruising' backward and forward between the same few mooring points. It is suspected that they are responsible for much of the litter. The Canals and Rivers Trust are said to be tackling this.

In spite of its many tourist attractions Ingestre and Tixall have no problems with visitors. The report that Ingestre Hall plans to expand its educational services to include residents other than those from Sandwell was welcomed.

Residents to the west of the parish tend to do their local shopping in Baswich and those to the east tend to shop in Gt. Haywood.

Bus services are poorly used and only provide a limited service with the result that they are poorly used.

Appendix 6. Comments received on Pre-submission Draft.

Numbers after some comments relate to the numbers on comments forms.

1.2. Advises that Appendix D lists both 'issues' raised by residents and the Council's response to them. However, when viewing App. D it only appears to show what support the Council intends to provide to meet the resident's needs – the issues are missing although you can perhaps derive them with a little thought. Andy Dunn.

1.3 Amend so that it reads as follows; 'Following successful independent Examination and public referendum, the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan document; Local Plan for Stafford Borough (PFSB) and will be used to determine planning applications for the area, unless another material consideration indicates otherwise.' SBC Delete paragraph as the process will be demonstrated in the Consultation Statement and in Development of the Neighbourhood Plan section. SBC.

1.5. The Council suggest adding a sentence to note when the Neighbourhood Plan Committee was established. SBC

1.7 The Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Suggestion that 'a number of' be inserted between 'were' and 'important' in the sentence 'Colwich Parish Council felt that there were important sites across the parish'. Cllr. Pearce.

1.9 Amend so that it reads 'Colwich Parish Council has decided that the Plan shall match the plan period of the Plan for Stafford Borough which is 2015-2031.' SBC.

1.10 and 1.11 delete as these will effectively be out of date on submission to the Council. SBC.

1.12 amend so that it reads; 'Following a pre-submission consultation, the Parish Council will consider the comments received and where necessary make amendments to produce a revised draft Neighbourhood Plan and submit this to Stafford Borough Council for public consultation and independent examination. An appointed Examiner will check that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the tests of the Basic conditions stipulated in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and will then issue a final report to suggest how the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed.' SBC

Section 2: Planning policy context

2.1 amend so that it reads: "In accordance with legislation, the Localism Act 2011 stipulates that Neighbourhood Plans must meet the Basic Conditions set out in Paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and County Planning Act 1990. To meet these, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations." SBC

2.3 and elsewhere in the document, "Sustainable Development" this part of the plan needs beefing up, we need to be crystal clear about what we and the rules believe "sustainable" actually means, it is this phrase that is always used when passing developments, we need within the NP to set out clearly the criteria in detail. Cllr. Pearce.

2.4 We concur with the comments set out at this para but raise concern that the NLP does not truly take account of these provisions within its main content. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

2.5 Amend 4th sentence so that reads:

"Part 2 of the PFSB sets out proposed boundaries for 11 key service villages, Recognised Industrial Estates (RIE's) and other topic areas. The proposed boundary for Great Haywood, Colwich and Little Haywood set out in Part 2 of the PFSB is prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan." SBC

2.6 The Parish includes part of Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. The Neighbourhood Plan therefore requires Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) under the terms of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. I note that part 2.6 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that the Borough Council does not require this. It would be

advisable to consult Natural England to confirm this and advise on the record that is required for this decision. The residential allocation for the Key service Village would be covered by the HRA of the Local Plan but this would not cover other Neighbourhood Plan policies. County Council.

2.6 Amend so that it reads:

“Neighbourhood Plans must comply with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations. Stafford Borough Council performed a Screening Assessment early throughout the draft stages of the Neighbourhood Plan to identify if any significant environmental effects are likely to occur as a result of the Plan and if the Plan is subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). The Screening Assessment, which is accompanied with the Neighbourhood Plan identified that no significant environmental effects were likely to occur and no other assessments were required.” The description of SEA and HRA are explained in the screening assessment and should therefore be deleted. SBC.

2.7 We question to what degree and in what manner, the Colwich PC have taken into account the decline in services in calculating the potential for sustainable development? Growth is required to ensure that local services/facilities continue to prosper and if anything, further development should be sought in these areas. See para 55 of the NPPF. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

2.7 replace second sentence with, ‘The PFSB Spatial Principle 4 sets out a settlement hierarchy and identifies settlements with the capacity to deliver growth and future development. This hierarchy identifies 11 key services, 2 of which are Great Haywood and Colwich and Little Haywood.’ SBC

Section 3: The neighbourhood area.

Section 3 to be summarised into one A4 page or moved in its entirety into an Appendix. SBC

3.1.1 Amend so that begins with “In 2008 Stafford Borough Council is identified as a growth point by the ...” SBC

3.1.2 Parish area of 28,750 sq.m – CPC should provide clarity that this is metres not miles as is being referred to in the preceding sentence. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.1.3 Not sure why ethnic diversity is mentioned here surely an aging population and the young leaving is more important to be mentioned here, threats to services schools etc. Cllr. Pearce.

3.1.4 add further explanation to describe what exactly the J.R.R Tolkein connection is and where this can be found in the Neighbourhood Area. SBC

3.1.5 are the garage post office and on the A51 wolseley or colwich? Cllr. Pearce.

3.1.5 I believe that Colwich includes Crossheads & Kingfisher Drive, both of which are all “over” the West Coast railway line. Mr. Maingay.

3.1.6 - no mention of the canals A51 rivers limiting development also HS2 should this however be in the transport section? Cllr. Pearce.

3.1.7 no mention of Tolldish. Cllr. Pearce.

3.1.8 There is no longer a Nursing Home. Mr. Maingay.

In describing the Neighbourhood Area, section 3, it is noted that the transport section (3.3) makes no reference to Rugeley Trent Valley railway Station, which appears to be the closer of the two Rugeley stations (Town being the other) to the parish. County Council.

3.2.1 Delete 3 rd sentence as this is factually incorrect. SBC.

3.2.6, the Council suggest identifying the source of information to support this statement. SBC.

3.2.7, 3.2.8 and 3.4.2 Are they relative to Colwich Parish Council? This need to be better explained showing the relation or otherwise deleted. SBC.

3.3.1. The roads within and around Gt Haywood are often congested as indicated in the Plan. Andy Dunn.

3.3.3 HS2 is envisaged to deliver prolonged construction disruption for 10 of the 20 years of this plan to the north of the villages. Cllr. Pearce.

3.3.3 For HS2, please use “the proposed HS2” throughout the document! Mr. Maingay.

3.3.4 Are these bus routes running still up to date? Cllr. Pearce.

3.3.4 ? 3 bus routes.. ie including the 841, if still running. Re the 825, it is important that it runs through Stafford TO the hospital; this should be included. Mr. Maingay.

In relation to bus services the X25 service is not listed in paragraph 3.3.4 that lists bus routes serving the Parish. The X25 operates hourly between Stafford, Rugeley and Lichfield along the A513. County Council.

3.4.1 It would be worthwhile providing a breakdown of the 2011 census in a table format. It is very disappointing for the community that only 3.3% of the population are 25-29 year olds. The NLP should find ways to encourage the younger generation to stay within the local community, which includes providing more housing. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.2.7, 3.2.8 and 3.4.2 Are they relative to Colwich Parish Council? This need to be better explained showing the relation or otherwise deleted. SBC.

3.5.2 This relates to our comment above and the need for smaller starter homes. 50% of existing housing stock is detached homes and not appropriate for encouraging the younger generation to remain in the area. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.5.2 In 2006 Stafford Borough Council transferred their housing stock to Stafford and Rural Homes. The Borough has no remaining stock in its ownership. All social housing in Stafford is owned by Housing Associations, the major stock holder, with approximately 80% of the stock of the Borough is Stafford and Rural Homes. SBCh.

3.6 There is very little information about the Cannock Chase Area of Natural Outstanding Beauty (AONB) and Shugborough Estate and suggests an additional paragraph would be useful to provide context to the Parish. SBC.

3.6. Reference is made to the Needwood and South Derbyshire Claylands National Character Area (NCA), as produced by Natural England, describing landscapes at a national scale. National Character Area Profiles can be accessed at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles#ncas-in-east-midlands> The Parish straddles three National Character Area landscapes: Cannock Chase and Cank Wood in the south; the Trent Valley Washlands occupying the valley floor of the Trent, and the northern parts of the Parish, which include the main populated areas, falling within the Needwood and South Derbyshire Claylands. These NCA Profiles could provide additional relevant baseline data.

In order to gain a full appreciation of the varied character of the Parish it would be beneficial to provide an overview of the landscape character types, as described in the County Landscape Character Assessment Planning for Landscape Change. Around half of the Parish lies within the Cannock Chase AONB. Whilst much of the AONB falls within the Character type Sandstone Hills and Heaths the north eastern part of the AONB extends into the Riparian Alluvial Lowland landscapes flanking the River Trent. Some of these areas have suffered some erosion of strength of character and loss of condition of landscape elements, as referred to in the text. In these areas there is a particular need to encourage landscape conservation schemes such as hedgerow maintenance, habitat creation and tree and woodland planting, to stem the decline in landscape quality that will otherwise become more evident.

To the north of the Trent, much of the land falls within the character type Settled Farmlands in the Needwood Claylands. The area to the east of Great Haywood extending to Moreton Brook has a policy objective of Landscape Maintenance within the Supplementary Planning Guidance, which indicates high strength of character and a landscape in good condition, where there is a need to ensure that development should be unobtrusive and does not lead to loss of characteristic features. County Council.

3.6.2 The location of the Green Belt is not clear from the description given. It would be better to provide a map at this point of the NLP. There is no Green Belt to the north of the A513 or A51, only to the south of the A513. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.6.3any Neighbourhood Plans including land within the AONB or adjoining it and having a potential impact, need to recognise the importance of protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of Cannock Chase AONB. The extent to which the AONB is recognised in your document is very much welcomed. The Neighbourhood Plan area covers the whole of the Parish and includes a substantial area of the AONB, including the Trent Valley, Shugborough and the parkland, woodland and heathland to the south of the A513. With this point in mind, we

welcome the cross reference to the AONB Management Plan (2014-19) in general and in particular the AONB Key Issues listed in Para. 3.6.3. AONB

3.6.4 from left field, but what are the chances of the villages becoming part if the ANOB as we are a conservation area? Etc. Cllr. Pearce.

Map 3 A legend should be provided for clarification. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.6.5 Now we have MORE street lighting, light pollution seems worse not bettr. Mr. Maingay.

3.6.6 In what document is the Butts listed as area of Active Landscape Conservation? It would again be worthwhile providing a map to provide clarity on what the 'surrounding area' is. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.6.7 Have there been any recent flood evaluations completed by SBC or CC recently? Cllr. Pearce.

3.6.9 should be amended to recognise that most of the Cannock Chase SSSI, including all of the area within the Parish, is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) designated by the European Union for its heathland habitats. County Council.

3.6.16. Within s3.6.17 the Plan identifies that both Great and Little Haywood are Conservation Areas. While these settlements are contained within the two Conservation Areas, their full details should be given (as recorded in the Conservation Area Appraisal) - the Colwich and Little Haywood Conservation Area and the Great Haywood and Shugborough Conservation Area. This should ensure that the full scope of these designations is fully appreciated within the Plan. It is also strongly advised that these Conservation Area boundaries are included on a separate plan of the area along with the location of all other designated heritage assets within the area. County Council.

3.6.17 In reference to the points raised here, I would draw the CPCs attention to the appeal decision for the land at Shenley Cottage (ref: APP/Y3425/W/15/3003745) in which the Inspectors concludes:

"25. The principal significance of both Conservation Areas lies in the core areas of the villages. The proposed development would be sufficiently removed from these parts of the villages that they would be unaffected.

Nonetheless, I recognise that the agricultural, open countryside that surrounds both Conservation Areas plays a role in their setting and thereby contributes to their significance as heritage assets.

26. However, having considered all of the evidence before me and having visited the area, I am satisfied that subject to careful consideration of the matters that would be reserved for future determination, the proposed development would not have a significant effect in this regard.

There are a number of reasons for this. The site itself is limited in scale such that a substantial area of open land around the Conservation Areas, including between the two villages, would remain open or undeveloped. In making this assessment I have taken into account the other development in the area identified in the evidence that has been granted planning permission, including at the land between Great Haywood and The Ring

27. Based on the indicative layout drawing, substantial portions of the site would also remain open or undeveloped and could be laid out to retain their existing rural character. Given the proposed development's scale and location along with the site's relatively elevated ground level, I recognise that the development would be apparent, at least in part, from within the Conservation Areas and from elsewhere.

Nonetheless, views into the development would, to a large extent, be screen or filtered by existing mature planting which could be supplemented as proposed.

28. For these reasons the development would not harm the setting of either Conservation Area..." LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.6.17 It is heartening to note that the Plan is making use of the Historic Environment Character Assessment of the Haywoods and that it recognises the important position that Shugborough (as a Grade I Registered Park) plays within the areas unique historic character. A better historic introduction (Pen Portrait, above) to the plan would also have highlighted the significance of Wolseley Park within the development of the plan area as identified below:

'Wolseley Manor was formed out of the manor of Haywood at around 1086 (Domesday) and

was leased by the bishop to a man named only as Nigel. The manor was probably held by the Wolseley family from at least the 12th century with their seat located on the north side of the Stafford-Lichfield road where a moated site (investigated in the 1980s) was found to date to the 12th-13th century. Wolseley Hall remained the seat of the Wolseley family until 1969 when the house was demolished. The estate was never large (covering around 673ha) but in the 1580s-90s, presumably taking advantage of Paget's exile, Thomas Wolseley was found to have illegally enclosed approximately 800 acres on the Chase; he was not alone in acting this way!

The Wolseley family were, like many great landowners in the area, instrumental in developing industries during the late medieval/early post-medieval period. In 1408 a member of the 'Glasmon' family is brought before the manorial court for 'committing offences within the lords' woodland'. Archaeological work within Wolseley Park has identified two separate glass working areas and evidence suggests that they were in operation between the 13th/14th century and again in the 16th century. Industry relied on proximity to woodland for fuel and (in the case of glass production) as an additive to the process. Wood became an increasingly scarce resource and in 1615 Parliament passed a law outlawing the use of wood as a fuel with coke taking its place and glassmaking quickly ceased within Wolseley.'

Below Ground Archaeological Potential

There also remains the potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains relating to late prehistoric and Romano-British activity within the valley of the River Trent. Information from an assessment of aerial photography and the results of subsequent excavations within Shugborough have recovered evidence for possible Romano-British activity and Bronze Age activity. County Council.

3.7.1 inset when there are accidents on the main motorways the A51 gets clogged, when there are accidents on the A51 the villages get swamped. Cllr. Pearce.

3.7.1.3, silt in the run off blocks the drains and does not allow water to drain away. Cllr. Pearce.

3.7.3.1 sets out the railway provision for the Parish. However, there are more services along both branches of the West Coast Mainline (WCML) through Colwich Junction that could be included in the plan. Two trains per hour in each direction up to Stoke-on-Trent (London to Manchester services) and many services that pass along the line through Stafford, although only one train per hour on the WCML stops at Rugeley Trent Valley and two trains per hour along the WCML stop at Stafford. There are no direct Birmingham services from either of these sections of the WCML; the nearest service to Birmingham is from Rugeley Trent Valley along the Chase Line - or services from Stafford to Birmingham via Wolverhampton.

We are aware of parking issues at Rugeley Trent Valley station, although no immediate solutions have been identified at present, with nothing specific regarding this matter in the rail strategy. It is also noted that the station is outside of the Plan area for the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan. County Council.

3.7.4.1 Confirmation was given by Severn Trent (on the above application) that the existing foul drainage can accommodate growth so long as appropriate improvements were made by any developer. It cannot simply be claimed that no further growth is capable. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

3.7.5 What about Colwich etc? Mr. Maingay.

3.7.6.1 HS2 will significantly increase the noise and dust in the area for a considerable time. Cllr. Pearce.

3.7.7.1 high speed broadband is now here. Cllr. Pearce.

3.7.8.1 delete last sentence in paragraph SBC.

3.7.9.2 High pressure gas distribution pipeline Sandon – Drayton Basset running to the east of Colwich; and Intermediate pressure gas distribution pipeline Colton Tee – Colton running adjacent Bellamour Lane. National Grid.

3.9.1 no mention of stretched rural ambulance services, no first responders, do we have a letter from the Doctors agreeing with the NP ideas on a new surgery and anything from NHS England supporting the plans, or services being moved to Stoke and Wolverhampton which will mean a greater need for local services. Cllr. Pearce.

3.7.10 Gas is available also in Colwich. Mr. Maingay.

3.12.7 ..line 3 ..integral SHOP/Post Office. Mr. Maingay.

Section 4: Community engagement

4.1 In light of the Moore Family Trust being one of the largest landowners in the area, it was disappointing that they were only invited to one consultation event and at no point was the allocation of Local Green Space discussed with the landowner at this time. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

Section 5: Key issues

5.5 can this be challenged can they just say it makes no difference between 5 small developments back to back and one big one? Cllr. Pearce.

5.5 Amend so that it reads "Key issues for the Neighbourhood Plan to address are:" SBC

5.5, In the 5th bullet point the Council suggest an inclusion to 'Improving the broadband infrastructure' could be added provided it is highlighted in the consultation. SBC

5.5 HS2 will effect all properties in the north of the parish an impact analysis will need to be completed before planning is progressed or any development started. Cllr. Pearce.

5.5 It is worth noting the extent to which the NP Key Issues (Para. 5.5) reflect the need to protect the landscape, scenic beauty and quiet enjoyment of the AONB, in particular bullet points 1 & 3. AONB.

We note that the need to prevent surface water and foul flooding is highlighted as a key issue and question whether fluvial (river) flooding should also be included. Environment Agency.

Section 6: Vision and objectives

6.1 I also recognise that the profile of these villagers is that of an ageing population to such an extent that Great Harwood is becoming more of a retirement than a true cross - section of society. Your vision and plan reflect this.

6.1 We raise some concern with the suggested vision; only in that some countryside will have to be lost to provide appropriate growth. As such, perhaps the vision should be reworded to be more proactive and in line with the NPPF. Our suggestion is as follows:

The villages and hamlets that make up the Parish will continue to be separate, quiet and peaceful settlements in unspoilt countryside. Its residents will have services that meet the needs of their physical and social wellbeing . LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

As someone who takes a great interest in young people, I am just a little concerned that your vision does not include an encouragement to promote the village as one for all ages. Social housing and larger houses will bring children into the village and although you recognise the need for leisure facilities, you do not mention how schools could support and encourage families to bring children from 0 -18 years into the village.

All existing schools, play groups, and toddler and baby groups do an amazing job at the moment, but have to market themselves. The document does not give the vision of any of the leaders of these groups. Jenny Pearce.

6.1 Amend so that it reads "The vision for the future of Colwich." SBC.

6.2 Natural England welcomes the environment related objectives set out under section 6.2 (Objectives - issues 'r' – 'z'). Natural England.

Section 6.2 (Objectives), Environment

It is disappointing to note that, bearing in mind the Neighbourhood Plan Areas demonstrable historic and archaeological potential, there are no specific or general policies relating to the historic environment.

It is suggested that the plan team consider developing policies to:

1) Require that new developments are appropriately located and informed by an understanding of historic landscape sensitivity as discussed within the relevant Historic Environment Assessment.

2) Where new development and/or extensions within the plan lie close to areas of historic sensitivity that their scale, massing, design and materials are informed by the areas unique historic character.

3) Where public realm works are proposed in areas of historic sensitivity (or within a Conservation Area) as part of a development, the designers are informed by areas historic character and by the joint Department for Transport and English Heritage

volume 'Streets for All: West Midlands'.

4) That any new development respect historic field and property boundaries and that where new boundaries (or replacement boundaries) are proposed that these are appropriate to the character of the area.

5) Where development is proposed within a Conservation Area or close to Wolseley Park, that early consultation be undertaken with the Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team and the Stafford Borough Conservation Officer and that a Heritage Statement be produced to support any application.

6) Where designated heritage assets are to be affected (either directly or indirectly) by a proposed scheme that a Heritage Statement be prepared in support of any application. Also that there should demonstrably be no negative impact, instead development should look to conserve and/or enhance the heritage asset and its setting.

Failing the inclusion of specific policies I would strongly advise that you include a statement such as below:

'Designated heritage assets such as Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings are protected by law. In all cases designated and undesignated heritage assets are protected through the planning system and as such developers should consult with the Local Plan and the relevant officer to discuss potential requirements which may include the production of Desk-Based Assessments, archaeological evaluation, detail mitigation etc.' County Council.

6.2.1 a) retain and *improve*. Cllr. Pearce.

6.2 h We have suggested through Part 2 of the PfSB that a settlement boundary should not be provided to ensure better flexibility for growth and that any development proposals simply accord with the provisions of SP7. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

6.2.1, the NP objective includes "Cannock Chase" (reference W), this is welcomed but there is scope for confusion between the designated area and other areas/organisations. We would suggest, therefore, that the AONB is referred to in full early on in the document i.e. as *Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty* and thereafter as the AONB. It could also be included in Appendix A (Glossary). AONB

6.2.1. (Objectives (F) and (P), Should the GP Surgery move outside the Parish, as mentioned last night, then this would reduce these difficulties and perhaps provide an opportunity to increase car parking facilities/children's play area. However, this has to be outweighed with the problem of local residents accessing a GP Surgery outside of the Parish with the existing poor public transport. (Key Issue (para 5.5.)– improve access to health services!). Andy Dunn

6.2.1 g) or just after HS2 construction period will be very disruptive. Cllr. Pearce.

6.2.1 Delete 'Objective 0' as this is considered to be unsustainable. SBC.6.2.1, 7.2.14 and 8.5. As we have taken out the racecourse site is it worth removing all mention of a large sports complex? Parish Clerk

6.2.1 o) We are happy to see specific objectives relating to green spaces and play areas, however we are concerned with objective 'o' which states that they wish to provide a large sports facility on the outskirts of the Parish. There is not, within the plan, much information on where they propose to put these facilities apart from saying that they cannot be at Jubilee Playing Field as they are not flat.

Whilst we accept that this area is sloping, we do believe that this is the best area for additional facilities as it will result in an area that provides facilities on a coordinated basis for the whole community. Whilst a sloping site can be technically more difficult to develop it is not impossible. SBCr.

6.2.1 You may wish to review the annotation of the Objectives – they appear to be out of order with repetitive descriptors (or am I missing something). Andy Dunn

6.2.1 x) we need an updated flood risk assessment by SBC. Cllr. Pearce.

6.2.1 z) include providing better access to water, waste disposal and small retail units. Cllr. Pearce.

6.2.3 Unable to locate the referenced 'Table 5'. Also, unable to locate Table 4 or its reference! Andy Dunn

Section 7: Policies and proposals:

7.2 Economy

7.2 needs a little more as to where specifically we would like more retail developments for the parish, and where the parking will come from. Cllr. Pearce

CLE1 definition is required in criteria a, to explain what is meant by small scale. SBC.

I note that the policies on employment and business (CLE1 – 4 primarily) tend to focus upon the sites and buildings within settlement boundaries and the villages of Great and Little Haywood. Whilst the AONB Partnership supports a thriving rural economy, there is always a need to balance economic benefits with any harm to the landscape scenic beauty and quiet enjoyment of the AONB. Within Colwich there are a number of pieces of land and buildings with ready access to the A513 and sites associated with the canal and parkland which have commercial and/or tourism potential. It may be of benefit for the NP to have a specific policy on rural business and development, including AONB considerations, to add a finer grain to the more strategic policies in the Local Plan. Should you take up this suggestion, I would be happy to comment on any draft policy. AONB

CLE1. I support both the promotion of businesses in the Parish and tourism although these may be limited with the local parking difficulties. Andy Dunn

Small scale is defined in the glossary using the governments definition ie 10 to 199. Is that what is meant in this policy? Would 'infill' be a better description?

PFSB Policies E1 and E2 cover quite a large range of issues. Is there anything specific that we would want? Cllr. Pearce mentions retail. Should there be site allocations and if so where?

7.2.2 - what is the difference between 1 large development and 5 small ones next to each other? will the developers be able to ignore this? Cllr. Pearce.

7.2.3 Promote local businesses. I would like to understand how the conversion of the Elms Businesses meets this requirement (also part of Stafford's Local Plan). My understanding is that the landlord made it very difficult for the local businesses? Please would you provide a response to this question. Stephen Bailey

7.2.4 I would love to see small business supported and encouraged. Affordable studio/workspace would be most welcome in the villages I would love to have somewhere local to work and show my work from. Helen Billingsley

7.2.4 To facilitate home working, thereby mitigating the traffic increases, priority should be given to upgrade the broadband available in the villages. Richard Edgington.

CLE2 Delete as this approach is set out in Policy E8 of the PFSB. SBC

7.2.5 Amend so that it reads "The Employment Land Review 2012 identifies land at Mill lane (EMP22) as not an attractive site however; it is a convenient location for local residents and could accommodate new small businesses." SBC.

7.2.7 the first sentence should be amended so that it reads "Proposals that demonstrate a business is no longer viable should be supported with evidence. In the case ..." SBC

CLE3 parking will be a big issue here unless part of the green surrounding is lost for parking bays for employees or/and customers.

CLE3 Amend so that it reads "The Parish Centre site should seek to encourage Class B1 use if it becomes redundant. Development must be appropriate in terms of scale, appearance, parking and impact." SBC.

CLE4 There is already parking issues associated with the surgery. We would raise concern that any retail/office use would create the same issue. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

CLE4 Amend so that it reads "The Hazeldene House surgery site should seek to provide a Class A or B1 use if the surgery becomes redundant. Proposals must show how the development ..." SBC

CLE4 despite lots of consultation there is no clear input from the Doctors about what THEY want, nothing in the plan, letters etc agreeing with current proposals. Cllr. Pearce.

7.2.9 There is ref to a new Medical Centre - but I can't find location. In an earlier draft It was to be located off Mill Lane near to the railway bridge. Has this proposal been dropped ? Dave Lockett.

7.2.9, 2nd sentence, the Council would like to see a description about what is meant by negative views. SBC.

CLE5 Nothing in the plan from the CCG, what are their plans for our area? Cllr. Pearce.

7.2.11 Hope surgery re-location will be given priority. 27

7.2.11. This is a major issue in the Parish both with a shortage of GPs, potential further reduction with forthcoming retirement of Dr Davis, and shortage of parking area that regularly leads to parking difficulties in and around the GP surgery; notably in Trent Close. The new homes being built within the Parish will, no doubt, further increase traffic and parking difficulties in this area. Should the GP Surgery move outside the Parish, as mentioned last night, then this would reduce these difficulties and perhaps provide an opportunity to increase car parking facilities/children's play area (Objectives (F) and (P), however, this has to be outweighed with the problem of local residents accessing a GP Surgery outside of the Parish with the existing poor public transport. (Key Issue (para 5.5.)– improve access to health services!). Andy Dunn.

7.2.13 to begin with “due to high staffing levels....” SBC

CLE6 Tourism facilities and Policy CLE8 – Visitor Accommodation may require consideration as Cannock Chase SAC has been identified as suffering from visitor pressure. County Council.

CLE 6 Encourage tourism by making the most of our connections to Tolkein and also Shugborough and the canal network. Helen Billingsley

CLE6 Delete as this is covered in Policy E6 of the PFSB. SBC.

CLE6. I support both the promotion of businesses in the Parish and tourism although these 6.2.1, 7.2.14 and 8.5. As we have taken out the racecourse site is it worth removing all mention of a large sports complex? Parish Clerk.

7.2.14 Cultural heritage/Tourism. For me this is a good objective to have, however surely this will bring additional cars/coaches to the village and increase congestion and car parking issues? Stephen Bailey.

CLE 6&7 Natural England welcomes the recognition of the parish's relationship with the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and cultural links e.g. the J.R.R. Tolkien connection. The Parish Council may wish to draw the attention of those planning new development falling within these policies to the Borough Council's PDF guidance on the Cannock Chase SAC Partnership project. Natural England.

CLE 7. We would also comment that it is important to allow for appropriate new development either close to or otherwise related to the canal in order to allow it to fulfil its potential as a valuable leisure, recreation, tourism and community resource, and Policy CLE7 reflects this by identifying land close to Great Haywood Junction as having the potential to accommodate tourist facilities. The Plan acknowledges the sensitivity of this location, and we would agree that any development here would have to be carefully designed. The Trust would wish to have the opportunity to comment on any proposals in this location at an early stage, in order to better understand how development will affect, and potentially benefit, the canal. Canal & River Trust .

CLE7 Amend so that it reads as follows, “Map 6 identifies the site opposite....” The Council further suggest this policy could be refined to accommodate a preferred use or allocating the site for tourism provision. Proposals for this site should also be agreed with Staffordshire County Council, Transport Services. SBC

CLE7 – Land for tourist facilities

We acknowledge the aspiration to maximise the economic benefit from visitors to the area and recognise a need for additional facilities. However, Policy CLE7 only identifies land and doesn't set out what sort of tourist facilities could be expected on the site. Further the proposed car park abuts the railway bridge, which could affect visibility for drivers exiting the car park. Therefore, careful consideration will need to be given to the location of the access to the land so that a safe access can be created with appropriate visibility. County Council. The River Trent flows across the centre of the plan area and is joined by the River Sow near Great Haywood. Both rivers have large areas of floodplain associated with them – Flood Zones 2 and 3. There are also a number of Ordinary Watercourses with associated floodplain as well as significant areas at risk of surface water flooding. Any proposals that are considered during the Neighbourhood Plan process should take account of this. When

considering any such development proposals you are recommended to consult the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Standing Advice for local planning authorities: <https://www.gov.uk/flood-risk-standing-advice-frsa-for-local-planning-authorities>.

Environment Agency

CLE 7 on new tourist facilities, for a site adjoining the AONB, should include a requirement for development to respect the setting of the AONB. AONB.

7.2.16 Amend second sentence to read, "The Conservation Area Appraisal notes it is a striking landscape feature, viewed from Mill Lane. The setts and copings are well preserved." SBC.

7.2.16 Quite apart from Shugborough, which already attracts many visitors, we have an area of particularly great beauty that has already inspired many writers and artists. This stretches from the Brindley Bridge (Ancient Monument) canal at Haywood Junction to Essex Bridge (Ancient Monument) and beyond. The proposed development of the land opposite the Brindley Bridge should greatly improve that area and the path under the railway into the village will be a boon. Dave Robbie.

7.2.17 Support for walk through meadow opposite Gt. Haywood canal junction. 16

We would very strongly recommend that the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan authority / group are made aware that any proposal within 10m of the operational railway boundary will also require review and approval by the Network Rail Asset Protection Team, and such schemes should be accompanied by a risk assessment and a method statement. Network Rail.

7.2.18 The canals not only add to the historic character and interest of the Plan area but also provide a leisure and recreational asset for the local community, as well as a tourist attraction, bringing visitors to the area in the form of boaters. There is the potential for boaters to contribute to the local economy by breaking their journey to take advantage of facilities such as shops, pubs etc. Canals & Rivers Trust.

CLE8 amended to read as follows, "Proposals for new Bed and Breakfast accommodation or the change of use of buildings to provide visitor accommodation will be supported providing development proposals conserve the quality and peacefulness of the Parish's built and natural environment. Proposals including static caravan sites or conversion from mobile to static caravans will not be supported. The scale of development must be appropriate" SBC Policy CLE6 Tourism facilities and Policy CLE8 – Visitor Accommodation may require consideration as Cannock Chase SAC has been identified as suffering from visitor pressure. County Council.

7.2.19 Probably my ignorance, but where & what is this "Weston Road cycle route? Mr. Maingay.

7.2.19 Suggested wording: *Given that the Parish has a high tourist potential there is relatively little visitor accommodation locally such as hotels, Bed & Breakfast or farm diversification which includes Bed and Breakfast. Therefore proposals for appropriate increases in business of this type would be considered in a positive light.*

7.2.20, Delete second sentence as this adds no value to the Neighbourhood Plan. SBC.

7.3 Transport

7.3.2 Parking at Rugeley Town is quite good. Mr. Maingay.

7.3.3 We note the concerns set out in 7.3.3 about connectivity between Colwich, the Haywood's and beyond. There are some issues for people travelling between the villages in the area due to the low frequency of service between Great Haywood and Little Haywood/Colwich.

Since D&G took over the 841/842 there were changes to how the services operated meaning reduced frequency between the two areas. Great Haywood still has an hourly service to Stafford and Hixon (and now more buses to Uttoxeter as well) and Little Haywood/Colwich still have the 825 every 30 minutes between Stafford, Rugeley and Lichfield but the links between the two areas have been reduced. County Council.

7.3.3 could we get a small shuttle bus between colwich through the haywoods to hixon and back to alleviate parking issues at the doctors. Cllr. Pearce.

7.3.4 an impact analysis should be carried out on ANY proposed planning in the Haywoods relating to HS2 and the impact during construction and on house prices after completion. Cllr.

Pearce.

7.3.4 Like to see better public transport, ie Sundays from Gt. Haywood. 31,

7.3.5 states the HS2 line will pass through the parish – House of Commons Library Standard Note SN7082 dated Mar 15 suggests a decision on the route may be announced in Sep 15 and thus the statement in the Plan may be a little premature. Suggest re-wording to indicate the potential for the HS2 line to run through the parish. Andy Dunn

7.3.6 In relation to Real Time Passenger Information you may wish to consider including further reference to the benefits for example '7.3.6 Real Time Passenger Information equipment at bus stops would provide important and current information to travellers this will enhance connectivity which will allow people, jobs and services to be better connected making bus journeys more attractive, encouraging modal shift which in turn will increase patronage.' County Council.

CTR1 Delete as this is addressed in Policy T1 and T2 in the PFSB. This policy as written suggests additional housing above the planned amount would be acceptable. SBC
CTR1 We believe it is unclear how policy CTR1 relates to objective (f) and how it will be applied.

The policy refers to the current level of road safety but does not define what that is; how it could be measured; or mitigated. In relation to parking provision we query why the policy only appears to be applicable to developments over the total shown in Table 1. This implies that the development in table 1 can be assimilated into the current provision without any further work yet the policy states current provision is limited. It may be more appropriate for the policy to provide support for development that can provide additional parking. The policy should also be applicable for all development that has potential to impact on parking provision.

In relation to part (b) of the Policy where it relates to schools further discussion is required. As drafted the policy would appear to apply to any development at a school regardless of whether it created extra traffic for example a sun canopy. It would be unreasonable to expect such a development to address traffic issues. It may therefore be more appropriate for the plan to refer to only development/s at schools that increase the capacity of pupils at the school. The matter of existing traffic issues associated with the school run could be included within the supporting text as a matter for the Parish Council and school to address in consultation with the County Council.

The evidence to support the policy is questionable. The Sweet Study referred to is not really applicable to Main Street and the study itself is by no means comprehensive and gives no firm conclusion. It was in fact an attempt to encourage further investigation and discussion. The traffic count data is from 2007 and therefore could be considered out of date. County Council.

7.3.7 recent survey should be included here speeding, accident increases etc. etc it will all get worse with more housing. Cllr. Pearce.

The Neighbourhood Plan should include some indication of how many people work outside the Haywoods and how they get to work, as well as the numbers working from home and in the Haywoods. Ingestre with Tixall.

7.3.9 if we want to support blocking development because of the narrowness of the roads, they should be listed here. Cllr. Pearce.

7.3.9 Parking withing village [Lt. Haywood] needs sorting out. 11,

7.3.10 Lt. Tixall Lane too narrow to cope. 8, 48,

7.3.10 electric car plug ins on streets also plug ins for mobility scooters possibly powered partly by solar. Cllr. Pearce.

CTR2 (sustainable travel), CTR3 (quiet lanes) and CTR4 (pedestrian facilities) are all welcomed but would perhaps be strengthened by a specific section in the justification to explain how better pedestrian and cycle access to the AONB would bring environmental, community and health related benefits. AONB

CTR2. How will development proposals be expected to deliver this policy? The PFSB set out requirements from new developments in particular working with Staffordshire County Council. The Council suggest Policy CTR2 is amended so that it reads as follows, "All new

development proposals will be expected to encourage the use of walking, cycling, and public transport through the design of good local street connectivity.” The rest of the policy should be deleted. SBC

7.3.11 the final location of the HS2 concrete works and the worker town will also impact on the locality if close by extra vehicles, dust noise etc. Cllr. Pearce.

7.3.11 Objective G looks to '*Reduce the need to travel and encourage the use of sustainable or shared forms of transport*'. However, I'm unsure how this can be achieved to any great extent with the proliferation in houses being built in the Parish (and close by) and with limited local employment opportunities the majority of residents work outside the Parish, with many using the back road to Stafford (Mill Lane). There may be an opportunity to improve public transport, (re-establish a railway station in the Parish!) although if achieved this would probably lead to an increase of buses on the perilous back road - a road with several dangerous areas including the blind l.h and r.h. bends heading out of Tixall to Stafford, the narrow road under railway bridge (Mill Road), and the narrowing of the road caused by a tree. (Key Issue (para 5.5 bullet 8) - improve public transport/infrastructure). Andy Dunn

7.3.13 Delete as this is not relative to Stafford Borough or Colwich. SBC

7.3.13 no attempt to find out where your residents work outside the parish. Ingestre with Tixall.

Policies CTR2 (sustainable travel), CTR3 (quiet lanes) and CTR4 (pedestrian facilities) are all welcomed but would perhaps be strengthened by a specific section in the justification to explain how better pedestrian and cycle access to the AONB would bring environmental, community and health related benefits. AONB.

CTR3 The County Council do not currently support the implementation of quiet lanes. Experience shows that they provide little benefit and are best suited to locations where pedestrian movements already far outweigh vehicle movements rather than a tool to reduce traffic flows. It is suggested that further discussion is required with the Community Highway Liaison Manager for the Parish to investigate possible alternate options to achieve objective (w) to improve footpath and cycle network. County Council.

7.3.19 Toldish and quiet lane.....HS2? Cllr. Pearce.

7.3.19 Post completion of the known housing developments, I concur with the potential for these roads to become a rat run; consideration is required to prevent this occurring and reducing the existing difficulties in Little Tixall lane and Coley lane. Andy Dunn

CTR4 - I would like to see a joined up wide pavement link up throughout the villages to allow people to get through the villages via mobility scooters, or bikes, get people out of their cars. Cllr. Pearce.

7.3.20 Work to keep public footpaths and bridleways open and accessible. Helen Billingsley.

7.3.20 Extend footpath from Cliffs to exit through gates on to Meadow Lane. 36,

7.3.20 Is there any chance of a path along the canal past the Lockhouse, directly to Essex Bridge? Dave Robbie.

7.3.20 The desire to increase the levels of physical activity is also welcomed and the public rights of way network should be integral to any schemes that are developed to promote this. The Rights of Way team would be happy to provide advice and work together on any schemes which benefit residents through improvements to the path network.

The Plan proposes the creation of new footpaths and cycleways but does not contain any details about how this will be achieved. The creation of new public rights of way, in particular, has to follow a formal legal process and requires the legal agreement of any affected landowners. The Parish Council should also encourage developers to enhance the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include:

- the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists across Staffordshire where there is currently a shortfall in available access routes.
- the creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking
- the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in

line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture . County Council.

7.3.23 We welcome the information within the plan and the aspirations to improve accessibility on the walking and cycling networks throughout Colwich. One oversight within the Plan is the lack of information about any proposals to improve provision for equestrians wherever possible. County Council.

7.4 Communities

7.4.3 Housing requirement.

Enough buildings in village – village is spoilt now. 4,

Enough development now 5, 6, 18,

Concern about green space being removed. 5,

Concern about future of Shenley Cottage. 24, 44,

Concern about [amount of] future housing development – esp social housing. 32,

Provide Flexicare housing on The Oracle site within Colwich Boundary or, new, Wolseley Bridge/Bishton boundary or provide Rural Exception site. 49

It [Mill Lane development] provides the opportunity to provide smaller starter house to suit local needs. Yes Eng.

I fully support the proposed zoning for future housing and hope more starter homes and social housing can be built as well as the usual unaffordable executive houses. I hope housing can be designed to fit into the village character. Mark Oliver.

7.4 It is not made clear within the document that Little Haywood and Great Haywood are to be treated as two separate Key Service Villages (KSV). Whilst the NLP must deal with the Parish as a whole, it must remain consistent with the PFSB and the NPPF and as such, planning matters should be looked at separately as well as in combination. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.4.6 A table should be provided separately for Great & Little Haywood. Little Haywood has only had a single planning consent (Coley Lane) for 11 dwellings, with all other development having been approved in Great Haywood. As such, Little Haywood should seek to provide further housing over the plan period. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD
Table 1, Suggest that this is replaced with the table below to show an updated and clear

Completions and Commitments for Colwich Parish						
Completions						
	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	Total 11/15 (4 years)	
Great Haywood	2	1	0	2	5	
Little Haywood	0	0	1	1	2	
Total	2	1	1	3	7	
Commitments as at 31.3.2015						
Great Haywood	238					
Little Haywood	20					
Total	258					

picture of housing provision within the Parish from the start of the PFSB plan period.

I support those aspects of the plan which aim to restrict housing development locally to no more than our fair share of the Stafford BC village allocations and agree with your proposed percentage share method. Mark Oliver.

7.4.8 and 7.4.9 Delete as this does not add value to the Neighbourhood Plan and will be

outdated very soon. SBC.

7.4.8 This para should make reference to the positive appeal decision for the site at Shenley Cottage, Little Haywood. The legal matter has now been resolved and this proposal will be approved in due course. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.4.10 Housing capacity.

Excessive noise from road traffic (The Butts), 7,

More building will affect traffic congestion, schools, health centre, drainage. 9,

Medical centre can't cope now. 8,

We would, however, like to point out that the level of new homes provision proposed within it, will stretch the infrastructure and resources available in the villages to the limit and no further housebuilding should be allowed extra over the numbers envisaged in the plan. Richard Edgington.

Drainage inadequate. 8,

7.4.10 and 7.6.18 States that the Hixon sewerage works has little headroom to service further development. However, new developments are still proceeding. Surely adequate sewerage infrastructure should precede housing developments. Dave Lockett

At Para. 7.4.10 (Bullet point 7 – Environment) reference is made to the AONB Management Plan and a statement is made that most visitors live within 6km and calls for development to be restrained in a 15km zone. This is not strictly accurate and I would suggest a simpler statement to the effect of: *“The presence of the AONB, the Special Area of Conservation and the Green Belt represent real and justified constraints on the scale location and type of new development which can be accommodated in the area in accordance with national policy.”* AONB
(See also 7.6 Infrastructure)

7.4.14 Settlement Boundaries.

Support exclusion of Cliff Road open space. 2,

I fully support the proposed zoning for future housing Mark Oliver.

I wholeheartedly support the policies that the plan outlines, with especial regard to maintaining the settlement boundaries. Anna Hindley

Danger of Roseacre site becoming an eyesore if it ceases to trade and is outside settlement boundary. 10,

Include Roseacre in boundary. 14,

Include Roseacre in boundary. MBD architecture Ltd

Unlike Roseacres site the Mill Lane site is not blighted by overhead HT cables which will be a concern to some members of the public and staff. Yes Eng.

Keep Racecourse field in plan. (Site plans) Taylor Wimpey.

Want northern boundary to remain as shown [finish at Greenacres ext]. 34,35, 52,

Hope the planning boundaries withstand unscrupulous developers. 30,

Include The Oracle site within Colwich Boundary or, new, Wolseley Bridge/Bishton boundary in order to provide Flexicare housing. 49

Boundary should include MFT site – suggested new SB submitted. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

The village boundaries should be rigorously enforced and the conservation areas protected at all cost. Richard Edgington.

7.4.3 If there is an “outstanding provision” of 91 new houses, any current or new applications for more than that number cannot be approved?? Mr. Maingay.

7.4.10 Doctors - do we have an estimate of how many extra patients have been estimated on the already overstretched surgery? can it be added. Cllr. Pearce.

7.4.10, bullet point 7 Environment, the sentence should read as follows

‘The Cannock Chase SAC, which is part of the AONB Management Plan highlights that the majority of visitors live within 15km of the AONB. Policy N6 in the PFSB seeks to ensure new development mitigates any impacts on the SAC.’ SBC

7.4.11 Delete as this is factually incorrect. SBC.

7.4.16, delete extract to PFSB SP7 as this not is necessary. SBC.

7.4.17 It should again be made clear as to whether the seven sites referenced are in GH

or LH. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.4.18 amend so that it reads "...outside the previous Residential Boundary in the Local Plan for Stafford Borough 2001..." SBC

7.4.20 - retirement flats could be mentioned here. Cllr. Pearce.

7.4.20, second sentence, the Council suggest deleting reference to three settlement boundaries as this is incorrect and amend the sentence so that it reads "Two settlement boundaries have been defined to provide developers with a clear indication of where new development is accepted." SBC

7.4.22 I assume the intent is to fix the Settlement Boundaries. But can they ? Recently we have seen such boundaries automatically extended to accommodate new development - such as the Shires (land adjacent to Greenacres, Main Rd, Gt Haywood). Dave Lockett Policy CC1 Settlement Boundaries

The proposed settlement boundary for Little Haywood is exactly the same as in 2001 but with only St Modwen site added. This provides no flexibility for future growth as it has been determined that there are no brownfield sites available in this Key Service Village. This is not proactive achievement of sustainable development and neither does it take account of the positive appeal decision given for Shenley Cottage, Little Haywood. This site should be included within the proposed development boundary. A suggested boundary is attached as was submitted to the PfsB Part 2 consultation. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

In CC1 and CC2, on settlement boundaries, we would support the intention to retain the separate character of Little and Great Haywood and note the contribution which undeveloped land adjoining Main Road makes to the setting of the AONB. AONB CC1 to begin as follows, "New development will only be supported ..." SBC.

CC2 Delete as there is no need to stipulate the boundaries remain separate. Policy CC1 seeks to achieve this. The Council suggest a new policy to demonstrate support for recreational use only between the settlements. Point 2 of Policy CC2 is not in either of the Settlement boundaries and should therefore be deleted. SBC

CC2 Separation of Settlements. Map 8 does not take account of recent permissions at Great Haywood (Main Road and Little Tixall Lane) or the recent appeal decision (ref: APP/Y3425/W/15/3003745) at Shenley Cottage, Little Haywood. In any event, we do not think that this is a proactive and positive plan for the area on the basis that it seeks to restrict development in the only location available for Little Haywood (to the west). LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

The policy does restrict development to the only location available in Lt. Haywood.

CC2. In relation to the proposed Policies, Policy CC2 is supported to avoid coalescence of the villages and detrimental effects on the landscape character. County Council.

7.4.23 SLR Consulting prepared a response to the Wildlife's Trusts comments on our appeal (ref: APP/Y3425/W/15/3003745). They confirm that "The minimum size of a traditional orchard is defined as five trees with crown edges less than 20m apart. In this instance the area in question only contains three trees it therefore would not qualify as an orchard based on the criteria defined in Section 41 of the NERC act" The Wildlife Trust was incorrect in making this assumption and it should not be referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Staffordshire Wildlife Trust has not conducted any on-site surveys of our client's land and no claims should be made without the evidence/findings to support them. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.4.23 Want to keep separate villages. 13, 23, 32, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 53,

I think it is vital we prevent the villages being turned into another messy urban conurbation such as we can see in areas like Cannock. To this end it remains essential we maintain buffers against inappropriate housing developments between the two villages of Little Haywood and Gt Haywood, and between Rugeley and Colwich. Mark Oliver.

It would be a great loss if the incredible habitat, rich in nature, between Little and Great Haywood were to be lost. I am very gratified to see that this is incorporated into our plan as the recreational use of this open space greatly increases my quality of life, and I am sure the many other walkers feel the same. Anna Hindley.

7.4.23 The [Mill Lane] site protects the Parish key objective of separating the villages. Yes Eng.

CC3. With regards to allocation of houses to people with a local connection - you may wish to look at the s.106 agreement for 'Greenacres' which gives a hierarchy of allocations to parish, neighbouring parishes, elsewhere. Parish Clerk.

CC3 an explanation or supporting text is required to show how the local connection will be determined. SBC.

CC3 A strong local connection should be defined. There should be a local connection policy which sets out who is entitled to the housing and what happens if there are no people meeting that criterion. This policy may make it more difficult for a Housing Association to be able to purchase the stock with more conditions on its lettings policy than standard. This could be offset by a comprehensive local connection policy that ensures homes can be let quickly if someone with a strong local connection isn't there to take on the property. SBCh.

CC3 It would be helpful to get an understanding of how the figure of 20% of new affordable housing let to people with a strong local connection was arrived at. Is this the level needed to meet local demand. Has consideration been given to whether a local lettings policy will apply to subsequent lettings? SBCh.

CC3 Too many 4/5 bed homes built recently – young people need reasonable chance of home. 40,

CC3a to read as follows, "Housing development must include properties of 1 and 2 bedroom homes and provide a mix of tenures." The last sentence in Policy CC3a to begin as "At least 20% of all new affordable..." SBC

CC3a If there is strong evidence of demand for one and two bedroom homes, this quite rightly should be raised. Some flexibility must be retained however; developers have good market intelligence and generally won't build properties they don't believe will sell. If there is a too prescriptive requirement on bedroom numbers, it could make certain schemes unviable and therefore the development may not proceed. SBCh.

CC3b The Local Plan requires 30% affordable housing on sites, of which the council currently requests 80% is social rent and 20% intermediate affordable housing. Affordable housing built with a contribution of grant from the Homes and Communities Agency is either Affordable Rent or Shared Ownership. Dependent on viability, housing developments have to provide a range of tenure as per the local plan, this policy appears unnecessary. SBCh.

7.4.26 PFSB requires 30% affordable housing, not 40%. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.4.26 30% of housing on sites of more than 12 dwellings should be affordable in Great Haywood and Little Haywood. Has this figure been used to calculate other requirements (such as the 20% figure above?) SBCh.

7.4.26 Village [Gt. Haywood] being spoilt by unaffordable homes. 20,

7.4.27 Retirement village would be very appreciated by 4 bed owners wanting to downsize. 29,

CC4 amend so that it reads as follows,

"Proposals for small scale affordable housing schemes on rural exception sites and on brownfield land will be encouraged." SBC

This is a subtle change to policy in that it suggests affordable housing schemes on exception sites OR brownfield land whereas policy CC4 encourages affordable housing on exception sites which are on brownfield land.

7.4.29 amend so that it reads, "...to have developments of specialist housing to cater for an ageing population" and delete the rest of the paragraph. SBC

CC5 Amend to begin as " Small infill development fewer than 15 dwellings will be supported within..." SBC.

7.4.30 We would note that, although there may be no requirement for residential sites, Stafford Borough Council have not ruled out development as long as it is supported and is also beneficial to the local area. It is important to note that the Neighbourhood Plan can still allocate sites to support local aspirations and the overall position of Stafford Borough

does not hinder the Parish Council in this regard.

By their very nature, smaller-scale developments will not deliver community benefits or affordable housing alongside the delivery of market housing. We consider that by focusing on developments of this ilk the Parish will miss out on a number of benefits and furthermore – through relying on the Borough Council to maintain a five-year supply focused largely on development related to the edge of Stafford – it may come to pass that opportunities arise for further planning applications based on a lack of housing land supply in the near future.

The Neighbourhood Plan gives the Parish Council a chance to positively plan for future growth in Colwich Parish and to secure benefits for the area. Furthermore, the land in the control of Taylor Wimpey would deliver a number of benefits, including:

- Circa 70 new dwellings including a proportion of affordable housing;
- Appropriate infrastructure contributions to ensure that there is no adverse impact on local service provision;
- Sports pitch, recreation and open space;
- Creating a sense of place and improving village life;
- Increase in local expenditure;
- Job provision throughout the construction phase; and
- Sensitive treatment for the HS2 Line to the north of the site.

We strongly believe that the Neighbourhood Plan should be more aspirational and should help to boost the supply of housing land across Stafford Borough.

We ask that careful consideration is put forward to this site [Racecourse] as there are clear benefits available and we are willing to work with the Parish Council to achieve a beneficial outcome for all parties. One such outcome may be a time-delayed allocation, which would allow the Parish to grow naturally but ensure that – should development be required for housing supply reasons – this site is available and the Parish Council's aspirations for it are set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. Taylor Wimpey CC6 Delete as this is addressed in Policy C3 in the PFSB. SBC.

7.4.34 the Council suggest the reference to 'deficiency of nearly 40,000sq.m of grass pitches' is deleted as this is factually incorrect. SBC.

CC7 Amend so that it reads as follows

"Housing developments of more than 10 dwellings will be expected to provide high quality equipped play areas for children to access on site or make contributions to provide an allotment or burial ground." SBC.

CC7 This goes against the overall vision the Parks and Open Space Service has for a network of quality open spaces/play areas. We believe that having each individual development provide onsite play areas can result in very small, substandard play areas that are not beneficial to the community. We would like clarification as to whether or not within the policy the Parish Council means an equipped 'play area' or just an open area of land that could be used for recreational/play purposes.

Within the KIT Campbell Open Space, Sports and Recreation Assessment (2009 and updated 2013) it highlights that there is a need a need to increase the size of the play area off St Mary's road. We support this recommendation and believe that a better play area could be developed within this existing area with contributions from new developments.

In conclusion we support the objective of protecting and enhancing existing recreational areas.

However, if within policy CC7 'play area' means an equipped play area we are unable to support the policy, as we consider that a requirement for all housing developments to provide an play area will result in small, insubstantial play areas. SBCr

7.4.36 Taking their comment on areas within developments, could we change this to contributions towards further development of the JPF and the St Mary's play area? Parish Clerk.

7.4.36 There needs to be a play area for children in Great Haywood. Even if it's only

small. The Jubilee play area is too far out of the village for younger children to go on their own. Helen Billingsley

7.4.38 Need more concrete proposals for recreational facilities. 46,

Utilities - Do we have a report from Severn Trent re water capacity for the area?, will this significantly change if HS2 decide to locate specific construction services nearby? Cllr. Pearce.

Police- are there any plans to improve policing? Cllr. Pearce.

Fire and Rescue - No mention of stretched ambulance services sometimes talking over an hour to get to the Haywoods then 40 mins to hospital. Cllr. Pearce.

Site Availability - HS2 buy land for construction then sell what they don't need on the open market will this be re-designated land?? Cllr. Pearce.

7.5 Environment

The overall set of environment policies is welcomed and in CE1(f) the protection of views affecting the AONB is supported. However, there may be scope to add another clause, for example; (i) *"where the location, scale and design of the proposal reflects the character of the local landscape and has no adverse impact on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB."* AONB.

CE1 outlines the thinking behind the plans but no specifics is this intentional. Cllr. Pearce.

Policy CE1 – Design is welcomed. Design that is informed by and sympathetic to landscape character should promote local distinctiveness and help to deliver landscape enhancement. County Council.

CE1 Amend first paragraph so that it reads "Planning permission will be granted for proposals that demonstrate good design and enhance the local character and quality of an area and the way it functions." SBC.

CE1. Amendments include;

removing criteria d from Policy CE1 and insert into Policy CE2, remove criteria f to replace criteria c in Policy CE2 and delete criteria h as this is a repeat of Policy CTR3. SBC.

CE1 We acknowledge this policy and particularly welcome the following themes:

c) Biodiversity

d) Visual and ecological value of streams

e) Walls/hedges

f) Important views . Natural England.

CE1 I would like to see more affordable smaller but family size homes, also some social housing as well a lot less of the toy town style, mock barn, mock tudor style of Executive homes crammed into the smallest plots possible with very little garden, no pavement and virtually no parking. Helen Billingsley.

CE1 could be effective if proposals were informed by the Village Design Statement. SBC.

7.5.2 CE1 & 7.5.5 are not mutually consistent; are we talking about not more than 2 or 3 storeys? Mr. Maingay.

7.5.2 We should encourage diversity in our community instead of becoming a commuter or retirement village for well off white middle class people. This kills our businesses, shops and sense of community. I would welcome more innovative forward looking styles of building too, like town centres villages end up all looking the same building a lot of similar bland style of houses drown out the historic character of the village. You can be forward looking and innovative in building without being in conflict with the existing buildings but build more interesting, individual styles of housing. Helen Billingsley

7.5.12 It is possible to preserve the character and heritage of the area while planning for the future. 50,

Historic Environment

There is little consideration as to the historic development of the settlements or the landscape encapsulated by the Neighbourhood Plan area. The plan lists 'over 64 listed buildings' and appears to include two Scheduled Monuments within this figure (they are currently separate designations with separate consideration in planning law and should be approached as such). In fact, Appendix E lists 64 Listed Buildings within the plan area and

four Scheduled Monuments. These figures should be explicitly reflected in the main body of the text.

The plan area retains considerable historic integrity and as such it is strongly advised that a more detailed pen portrait be prepared to enable a better contextual understanding of historic character across the area. In turn this understanding could inform as to the location, design, scale and form of future developments within the plan area. The portrait can in part be extracted from the existing Historic Environment Assessment as well as the recently completed Conservation Area Appraisals (referenced in the plan). Shugborough has also recently completed the preparation of a detailed Conservation Management Plan of the parkland and this may also help with the production of this portrait. The small settlements of Great and Little Haywood retain considerable 'estate village' character while the influence of the Trent and Mersey canal and later the railway cannot be underestimated.

NPPF para 158 (Plan Making – Using a proportionate evidence base) advises that Local Authority Plans should be based on an 'adequate, up to date and relevant evidence base'. While this relates to LPAs in their plan making process, the same aspirations should hold for Neighbourhood Plans where policies are informed by an understanding of the historic character of their area. This informed and evidence-based approach will provide a more robust base should the plan be tested by a developer at a later date

A list of heritage assets (designated and undesignated) is recorded within the plans appendices, but this data is not utilised within the main body of the plan to inform understanding of historic character or indeed the policies contained therein. This office would be happy to comment on any updated historic environment pen portrait either as part of a subsequent submission or a separate document. County Council.

CE3 further explanation is needed to explain what Amenity Green Spaces and how these differ to Local Green Spaces. The Council suggests indicating Amenity Green Spaces on to a map. SBC.

7.5.15 In regard to the Colwich Parish Neighbourhood Plan I am pleased to see a section specifically on green space and the acknowledgement of how important green spaces are for communities. SBCr

7.5.15 Concern at loss of green spaces 5, 53,

Zion chapel site ideal as open green space area. 5, 23, Lisa Elkington-Bourne

Zion Church to be made Green Lane to preserve natural surrounding and frontage, 50.

Zion Church to be made Green land to ensure its never built on, 51.

Recommend that land at rear of Zion Chapel be added to Local Green Spaces to enhance the provision. Could be used to create or improve the wildlife corridor as the site has been put forward for development and encountered considerable opposition. 52

Loss of greenbelt. 13,

I think we need to maintain green spaces in the non housing areas, improve and maintain existing fields, trees and hedgerows and try to maintain as much land as possible for nature conservation, flood defence, and other ecosystem services or we risk losing much of what makes the villages such a great place to live in. Mark Oliver.

CE4 rephrase so that it is clear and effective. The Policy to read as "In accordance with the NPPF paragraph 81, recreation development will be permitted only on designated areas shown on Maps 11-19." SBC.

CE4 Local Green Spaces. This policy contradicts Policy CC1 in that LGS 4-9 are outside of the proposed settlement boundary in any event and would not be acceptable (by the Parish Council) for development. CPC have included 5 parcels of our clients land (Moore Family Trust - MFT) as Local Green Space (LGS) – 2 of which form part of the current planning appeal which was determined positively (with the exception of the legal matter which we are now resolving).

The landowners have not been consulted upon in this regard and have not been asked for their permission/comments on such a proposal. LSP and MFT met with the PC on one occasion, but LGS designations were not discussed at all. MFT object to their land being designated as LGS and seek for it to be removed from the NLP as was done so within the

Gnosall NLP. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

CE4 Local green space - within the document or the explanations it needs to be clear that this designation does not protect the site from development, managing expectations here is important. Cllr. Pearce.

CE4-CE6 We welcome these policies. Natural England.

7.5.17 Support for green space designation. 19,

7.5.17 This is a dubious assumption and should be supported with appropriate evidence as per para 77 of the NPPF. We do not feel that the areas demonstrated on the maps have been allocated using any specific methodology or evidence, only a resistance from the community to support development on our clients land. The Ecological and Landscape Assessments prepared and submitted with our appeal (APP/Y3425/W/15/3003745) were accepted by the Planning Inspectorate and the site seemed suitable for development. This comprises of LGS 6 and 7. No such evidence has been provided which demonstrates otherwise. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

Grass area at the end of Marlborough Close ST18 0SF be designated a Local Green Space. Submitted by 12 local households.

7.5.18, 4th sentence, the Council considers the outcome of the total number of Local Green Spaces (LGS) that are being designated amount to a large tract of land. The Council suggests further explanation of the reasons why these spaces must be designated (short paragraph) deleting the description of location. LGS designation must be compliant with NPPF paragraph 77 as many of the spaces designated in the Plan are considered not close to the community to serves. SBC.

7.5.18 Extensive tracts are not permitted by para 77 of NPPF but it is clear from see maps 22(a) and (b) that there are two distinct tracks comprising LGS 4 and 5, and LGS 6- 9 of 9.6ha (23.7 acres) and 5.7ha (14.1 acres) respectively.

MFT are happy to meet with the CPC to agree some of the land to be shown as LGS, this includes land shown within the capacity plan for the appeal. However, they objected to these areas of land being designated without any consultation with them as landowners. Additionally, we have concerns over how any designation may seek to preclude the agricultural tenant from ploughing/reseeding or other activity on the fields and, as such, impede his ability to farm the land with maximum efficiency.

The total area of the proposed LGS is 15.3ha (37.8 acres) which is more than 50% of the total holding owned by MFT.

LGS4 We question on what basis the CPC believe this was a route for salt or coal transport. The landowners have seen no evidence of this and additionally, there is a steep incline on this parcel of land.

LGS5 Dew ponds known locally as marl pits or pit holes. Clay was excavated and spread on the fields to improve the soil quality. Also many local marl pits provided clay for the former Little Haywood Brickworks which was cited on Coley Lane, near the junction with Penn Croft.

LGS6 The ancient track way is not a public right of way. Hedges are overgrown because they have not been maintained by the tenant in accordance with the terms of his Lease.

LGS7 There is no public right of way over this field and the footpath to the north has highly restricted views of this field. We have seen no evidence of this land being used as an archery. Butts is the name given to the stone formation between Little Haywood and Great Haywood (see 3.6.8).

LGS9 It should be made clear that the informal track is not a public right of way. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

CE5 on nature conservation sites is welcomed in principle but it is suggested that the detailed wording is agreed with Natural England and the SAC (Special Area of Conservation) Partnership. AONB.

CE4-CE6 We welcome these policies. Natural England.

CE5, the Council suggests a supporting paragraph is needed to explain a number of Biological important sites have been identified across the Parish from records provided by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust including sites of Biological Importance and Biodiversity Alert

Sites. SBC.

CE5 Amend so that it reads

“Development within 300m of a Biological Important Site (See Appendix F) should seek to enhance the site where necessary, providing a link or buffering habitat as part of the development or adjoining ecological network or contributing to the site’s long term management.” SBC.

7.5.19 – Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) the Parish Council may wish to add in a web link to the Borough Council guidance for this project (‘Cannock Chase SAC – Mitigation guidance in respect of new residential development’). Natural England.

7.5.19 Delete as this is addressed in Policy N6 of the PFSB. SBC.

7.5.19 Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Part of this designated site lies within the parish and is given protection at an international level in recognition of its wildlife value – primarily for its dry and wet heathland habitats and dependent species. In order to conserve this important habitat for current and future generations a partnership of local planning authorities are working with the Cannock Chase AONB unit, Forest Enterprise, Staffordshire County Council and Natural England in order to ensure that new residential development in the wider area contributes to measures to safeguard the SAC. The Borough Council has produced guidance for applicants/developers explaining more about how the scheme works and we attach a copy for reference (please see separate PDF document). If you have any questions about the project please contact me (contact number below) or Stafford Borough’s Cannock Chase SAC Partnership representative, Alex Yendole. Natural England.

7.5.20 Amend so that it reads “The Parish includes three Ecosystem Action Plan areas that are identified in the Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan.” SBC.

CE4-CE6 We welcome these policies. Natural England.

CE6 and C12. These policies could encourage the use of above ground SUDS where possible to enhance wildlife and biodiversity. County Council.

CE6. The justification to Policy CE6 and in particular, the intention to work in partnership to the benefit of the AONB at 7.5.26, is welcomed but for complete accuracy the intention should be expressed as: “Colwich Parish council will work in partnership with the AONB *Partnership...*” AONB.

CE6 – Biodiversity and Policy C12 - Green Infrastructure are welcomed as in accordance with the White Paper for the Natural Environment and Biodiversity 2020. Rights of Way . County Council.

CE6. The Council requires further explanation about the emerging Colwich Green Infrastructure Plan. This should be introduced as supporting text before Policy CE6 is introduced. SBC

CE6. We continue to recommend that policy relating to Biodiversity (CE7 now renamed CE6) references the Humber River Basin Management Plan and its knock-on impacts for water-based ecology and habitat, particularly since the policy has been revised to omit any specific references to enhancing watercourses contained within draft Policy CE7 (d) of the previous version of this plan. We would therefore welcome greater acknowledge of the water environment’s ecological value and the opportunities that development brings to enhance and improve rivers and streams. Environment Agency.

7.5.24 Preserve trees and hedgerows, Helen Billingsley

CE7 should include an introduction to explain what is meant by enabling development. This must conform to Policy N9 in the PFSB. SBC.

7.5.27. The Council requires further explanation of the planned Tolkien Trail including details of how and where this can be accessed. The trail should be clearly identified on a map, if this is to promote the J.R.R Tolkein connection. SBC.

CE8 can we ask that all new developments have solar panels? Cllr. Pearce.

We would very strongly recommend that the Colwich Neighbourhood Plan authority / group are made aware that any proposal within 10m of the operational railway boundary will also require review and approval by the Network Rail Asset Protection Team, and such

schemes should be accompanied by a risk assessment and a method statement. Network Rail.

CE8. Being a practising chartered electrical engineer I full support the provision of renewable generation, where reasonably practicable, within the Parish provided some benefit is realised by the Parish/local community. Andy Dunn

CE8 Replace title with "Proposals for a Solar Farm". The Council also suggest Policy CE8 is amended so that it reads as follows "Map 20 identifies land north of Great Haywood Marina for a solar farm to provide photo voltaic power. The solar farm should be less than 5ha and designed to protect local wildlife populations. Sites should show..." SBC.

CE8 We note the relevant plan objective ('X'). This will need to be read alongside the adopted Borough Council policy safeguarding the AONB (policy N7). Natural England.

7.5.31 Renewable power generation. I would only support this if it benefitted the parish (rather than an individual/company). Whilst it states wind farms are too prominent, I personally do not find them offensive. Turning to solar power, I agree it is likely to be less intrusive from a distance, but for the duration of the scheme there will be an impact. Therefore I would be more comfortable if it generated jobs and/or it was a community scheme. Stephen Bailey.

7.5.31, Amend second sentence. After the words 'Map 20', delete the remaining sentence. SBC.

7.5.32 delete due to recent government guidance. SBC.

CE9. The Council requires supporting text to explain what Historic Highways are and their significance, with an indication on a Map showing where these are in order to support Policy CE9, otherwise delete this policy. SBC.

CE9 There needs to be further information provided on this, including the location/use of such highways and how the CPC plans to enforce their established use. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

CE9. The Council requires further clarification to Policy CE9 on what new proposals should seek to achieve. SBC.

CE10 Amend so that is reads "Proposals adjacent to the Canal should seek to enhance, protect the local character and appearance of the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area as set out in the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal Stafford Borough Council 2014." SBC

CE10 Canals - we need more about getting water points, waste points advertising facilities in the villages, generating more businesses from passing trade. Cllr. Pearce.

We are pleased to note that the Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal and the Trent & Mersey Canal are both acknowledged to be important and valuable features within the Plan area, and that their protection and enhancement forms part of the overall vision and objectives of the Plan. In particular we also welcome the inclusion of a specific policy to promote and enhance the canals within the Plan area (Policy CE10).

It is important that new development proposals consider how they might affect the canals, and have regard to their conservation area status. Proposals should respond accordingly to address any potential impacts, and we would comment that it is also important to avoid being overly restrictive, and to recognise that development proposals close to the canal can make a positive contribution to the character, appearance and overall vitality of the canal, and seek to ensure that appropriate development can still be accommodated, whilst restricting inappropriate development which detracts from the intrinsic value of the canal. Canals & Rivers Trust.

7.6 Infrastructure

7.6 no mention of the car commuting problems along the Tixall Road into Stafford, and to get the train to Birmingham, etc.. Ingestre with Tixall.

The number of new homes proposed will lead to unsustainable road traffic increases.

There are few jobs available in the villages and most employed people commute by car.

The bus services are not good enough and there is no train station. Richard Edgington
Tixall Road to Stafford is becoming busier. Can it be widened/straightened? 31,

Mill Lane rail bridge requires attention to make safe. 16,
Concern about extra traffic. 25, 32, 33,
7.6 Roads too narrow, poor sewerage and drainage, doctors overloaded. 13, 41, 44, 53,
When development occurs roads, schools, surgery will be totally inadequate. 15, 20, 23,
24, 47, 48
Worry about schools and doctors. 38,
Support some new housing but with appropriate infrastructure. 50
Concern about infrastructure esp. roads, lack of employment and education. 39,
7.6.3 CiL will be available soon should we list our wish list in order of priorities? Cllr.
Pearce.
7.6.3 to 7.6.4 are deleted, as this is factually incorrect. SBC.
CI1 Amend so that it conforms to Policy T1 in the PFSB and is also agreed with
Staffordshire County Council, Transport Services. SBC
7.6.5 Parking is a issue, I would like to see local people encouraged to walk to school,
doctors and shops where possible instead of driving a short walkable distances.
Encourage use of the memorial hall car park to relieve pressure on the surgery car park. I
don't think that people who use the surgery from outside of the village would know they
can park at the memorial hall. This may relieve parking issues in the surgery car park and
in front of the shops. Helen Billingsley
7.6.5 Similarly in your section on Highway infrastructure there is no mention of the car
commuting problems along the Tixall Road into Stafford, and to get the train to
Birmingham, etc. Ingestre with Tixall.
7.6.5 The roads in and around Great Haywood can be congested at the best of times and
in places are dangerous (this is in part discussed in my email re footpaths). Objective g
states 'Reduce the need to travel ...'.
How can this be achieved with the growth of in houses, not only in our parish but also with
the number of new homes being built in Hixon? Employment opportunities are limited and
a large number of residents may work in Stafford. A proportion of workers (may include
those in Hixon) may use the back road in to Stafford – a minor road.
Increase population and improved public transport (an objective) – more busses on the
narrow road?
I suspect we have all seen or at least heard of impatient drivers along the road (I have
seen it) and one recent example was posted on to the Great Haywood Facebook page on
23 May
I know its outside of our parish, but the road in my opinion is particularly dangerous at the
following points:
Narrow road under railway bridge going out of Great Haywood, with no footpath
Just after leaving Tixall and going up the hill towards Stafford the road bears to the right
Then just afterwards over the brow of the hill, and Further along where an old tree
narrows the road significantly (not the same place as the recently removed tree on the
corner at the farm entrance)
All of these factors will only exacerbate the current situation. Stephen Bailey.
7.6.5 Junctions on to A51. These are dangerous and I cite a few examples, that I am
aware of from the last few weeks. I am sure that you are aware that the Colwich junction
is perceived as the safer of the two junctions (I assume as it has the 40mph limit in place)
and I know of drivers who drive through the villages so that they don't have to turn right
out of Great Haywood.
Serious car crash on A51 (15 May I think)
About a week later I saw a moped rider on the floor at the Wolseley Arms (with a blue VW
Passat stopped on the road)
From my own personal experience around 21 May. I approached the A51 junction (at
Roseacres) and there were two other vehicles in front of me already stationary at the
junction. With traffic it took me over 5 minutes to turn right (this was around 11am so not
rush hour)! However, the car in front of me turned right (a bit of impatience I would
suggest) and was almost rear ended by a van travelling towards Rugeley. This I can testify

was a very near miss and would have resulted in a serious incident at the speeds involved. Stephen Bailey

7.6.8 A definition of "Third Sector volunteers" needs to go in the Glossary. Mr. Maingay.

7.6.11 Move to a new paragraph after paragraph 7.2.8. SBC

7.6.11 Medical facilities need to be enlarged. 11, 31,

7.6.11 Doctors surgery. This is a real issue, currently there is a shortage of doctors (national shortage means that there is no short term fix too). However, assuming that a new doctor is appointed it is likely that the new homes being built/built in Hixon (Blenheim Manor) will become patients before any new houses in Colwich Parish are built. This will increase traffic, as they are unlikely to walk, and associated parking problems.

A surgery may open in Hixon and remove this issue, however I would expect there will be an issue in the short term at least. Stephen Bailey

I am also pleased to see that the burial ground and doctors surgery have been considered and should be accommodated within the plan. Anna Hindley

Need purpose built surgery. 12, 15,

Proposed junction at Mill Lane (new medical centre) highly dangerous. 15,

Want more concrete proposals for medical facilities. 46,

Policy CE6 – Biodiversity and Policy CI2 - Green Infrastructure are welcomed as in accordance with the White Paper for the Natural Environment and Biodiversity 2020.

Rights of Way . County Council.

CI2 We welcome the direct reference to wildlife habitats in terms of linear corridors and stepping stones. Natural England.

Policy CE6 and CI2. These policies could encourage the use of above ground SUDS where possible to enhance wildlife and biodiversity. County Council.

The Council suggests an explanation in the supporting text to demonstrate what is meant by green and blue spaces in Objective t. SBC

CI2. The strategic approach to the planning and delivery of Green Infrastructure in Policy CI2 is welcomed and the AONB Partnership would be pleased to offer advice on the preparation of the Green Infrastructure Plan referred to in Para. 7.6.15 and to any detailed projects which follow (see also 7.6.27). AONB.

CI3. The plan generally recognises the need for new developments to take account of flood risks and the inclusion of this in objective x and Policy CI3. Environment Agency.

CI3 In relation to Policy CI3 it would be useful to the policy to refer to the emerging SUDS Handbook. The Neighbourhood Plan could also recommend local preferences for specific types of SUDS that would be in keeping with the local landscape character. We would be happy to discuss this further and provide guidance if requested.

Regarding the requirement for flood risk assessment and drainage surveys, the Plan needs to be clear what is required and if this is different to the arrangements that are already in place. The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance set out where site-specific flood risk assessments are required as:

"A site-specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1; all proposals for new development (including minor development and change of use) in Flood Zones 2 and 3, or in an area within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems (as notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency); and where proposed development or a change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding."

In addition, Staffordshire County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority is a statutory consultee for major development (residential greater than 10 properties, commercial greater than 1000m²). These applications should contain a surface water drainage strategy that will ensure that surface water will be managed in accordance with technical standards and will not adversely affect flood risk outside the development. We also ask to be consulted in a non-statutory capacity on minor habitable developments that are in the floodplain of the updated Flood Map for Surface Water (30yr and 100yr) or within 20m of a recorded flooding hotspot. County Council.

7.6.16 Flooding. As of the 15th April 2015, in its role as a Lead Local Flood Authority

(LLFA), the County Council became a statutory consultee for the planning process. In considering planning applications for major developments, Local Planning Authorities will need to consult the County Council on the management of surface water. Local Planning Authorities will also need to ensure, through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations, that there are clear arrangements in place for the lifetime maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS.)

We are in the process of developing a SUDS handbook to give guidance on how SUDS can be designed to provide a range of benefits for water quantity and quality; biodiversity; amenity; and to set local standards. It is expected that a draft of the guidance will be published in the summer of 2015. It would be useful if the Neighbourhood Plan as it evolves has regard to this guidance. County Council.

7.6.17 We agree that developers should carry out their own investigations, but these must be done in association with Severn Trent. When carried out by independent experienced consultants, it should not be for the local community to simply rebut or ignore the conclusions and recommendations made within such assessment. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.6.18. We welcome the acknowledgement of the potential foul drainage issues from Hixon Sewage Treatment Plant in para 7.6.18. It should be highlighted that should upgrades be required to these works to accommodate additional loading on the system due to additional housing, it may impact on the timeframes in which development can come forward. It may be prudent to explain this in the plan to ensure that further growth takes this adequately into account. Environment Agency.

7.6.23 The flood mitigations works [at Mill Lane] will have the opportunity to enhance wild life habitat. Yes Eng.

The statement in 7.6.23 stating that the Parish Council will work with the Environment Agency to include desirable flood management projects in its Green Infrastructure Plan is welcomed. Environment Agency.

CI5 include details about how the proposed site can be accessed. SBC.

Policy CI5 – Land for Burial Ground

In considering the potential site for a burial ground careful consideration will need to be given to the access and parking arrangements to ensure highway safety. The potential site identified on Map 21 would require a vehicle access directly off the A51 and could prove to be prohibitively expensive. Consideration would also need to be given to slow moving funeral cortege's accessing the A51. Further discussions are suggested with the County Council's Highways Development Management section. County Council.

Policy CI5 It is risky to allocate a site with no established vehicular access. Any access off the A51 will be costly to construct and CPC should consider this before making any commitments; a highways assessment should be prepared. Given that MFT has a wealth of land within their ownership, we would again be happy to discuss such a proposal with CPC is considered appropriate. LES STEPHAN PLANNING LTD

7.6.25 Burial Ground needs to be acquired urgently. 11, 12,

Map 21. email Mr. Smith points out that there is no underpass giving access to potential burial site. So the sentence 'There is safe pedestrian access under the A51 but vehicular access would need to be provided.' is incorrect.

I am also pleased to see that the burial ground and doctors surgery have been considered and should be accommodated within the plan. Anna Hindley.

The strategic approach to the planning and delivery of Green Infrastructure in Policy CI2 is welcomed and the AONB Partnership would be pleased to offer advice on the preparation of the Green Infrastructure Plan referred to in Para. 7.6.15 and to any detailed projects which follow (**see also 7.6.27**). AONB.

Table 2 lists the Infrastructure costs and funding associated with the Plan. We query where these costs have come from and how they have been derived. For example in relation to the £50,000 flood defence scheme at Colely Lane we are not aware of a specific scheme as defined or what it entails.

With regards funding we appreciate and note that estimate of CIL income is difficult to

establish (7.6.28). However, when considering the amounts assumed and the timeframe involved it would appear that of the 264 housing you are expecting (Table 1) 251 are wither completed or committed therefore are will not contribute to CiL. Development will only become liable to a CiL charge after the Borough Council has adopted a charging schedule.

It is therefore likely that the funding element of the plan may require review.

In relation to Highways/transport funding from the County Council would only be available where proposals are already identified in the District Integrated Transport Strategy or at a level where the local Division Highway Programme (DHP) could contribute with support from the Local Member. County Council.

7.6.28 the Council require further justification to show infrastructure costs and funding calculations. SBC.

Where items are not specified the costs represent the amount of CiL funding that the Parish Council is prepared to allocate and reflects the relative costs and priorities in the Plan.

The cost of correcting the highways deficiencies identified in Appendix I range from about £1,000 for signage to £1m plus for major changes to railway bridges.

Footpaths and cycling . Costs range from £50 a metre for hard surfacing a path (support in questionnaire) to some £1,000s for addressing the problem of steps down to the Trent & Mersey towpath (County Paths Initiative bid by Parish Council).

Bus service of 7 miles twice on Tuesday with 29 passengers a month in Oxfordshire fully subsidised £3,000 pa. On this minimal data a similar length trip with similar patronage and double the service for 5 days would be $3000 \times 2 \times 5 = £30,000$.

Car parking could be provided by removing a property to provide the land but the costs of purchase, demolition and surfacing would be high.

The cost of the burial ground could increase substantially if the present preferred site is pursued due to the cost of access off the A51.

It's difficult to see what more can be provided as far as calculating funding except to repeat them using the figures now available in the draft charging schedule. In Colwich these would range from £70 to £100. Assume an average of £85. The recalculated total is 75% of the target number of houses $(259) \times £85 \text{ per/m}^2 \times 97 \text{ sq. m.} \times 25\% = £1,601,159$. Alternatively assuming 1,000 properties attract CiL as estimated in the draft charging schedule and that Colwich gets these in proportion to its population then this gives a figure of $4528/130869 \times 1000 = 35$ houses. The estimated total funds now becomes $75\% \times 35 \times £85 \text{ per/m}^2 \times 97 \text{ sq.m} = 216,431$. Taking an average of the two estimates gives about £900,000 which is used as a working figure.

Table 2. Infrastructure costs and funding.

Item	Costs	Notes
Administer CiL funds	£1k	Clerk's salary for administration.
Highways work.	£5k £16k £55k	Quiet Lanes. CiL funding Dropped kerbs. CiL funding + SCC Contribution to other Appendix I items
Footpaths and cycling	£10k	CiL funding.
Public transport	£30k £5k	Bus service improvements. CiL funding(25k) + SCC Support Voluntary Car Scheme. CiL funding
Car Parking	£500k	Off street and bays contiguous with carriageways. S106 + CiL funding(400k) + SCC
Electricity		Funded by developers
Gas		Funded by developers. Work required on medium pressure supply.

Water		Funded by developers/Severn Trent. Some concern about additional supply.
Waste water		Funded by Severn Trent. Hixon site on Amber.
Telecommunications		Superfast Broadband. Funded by BT.
Flood mitigation	£50k	Coley Lane. Equal s106 & CiL funding
Green infrastructure	£260K £20k £35k	Open space funded by s 106 agreements Green Infrastructure Plan. CiL funding Green Infrastructure. CiL funding
Allotments	£20k	1.4ha land for 50 plots. CiL funding
Burial Ground	£200k	0.4ha site inc access, 20 years capacity. CiL funding
Education	£1.6m	Funded by s 106 agreements
Recreation	£60k	Mainly provision for Gt. Haywood. Funded by CiL
Total	£2.867m	£900,000 from CiL

7.7 Local Monitoring and Review.

No comments.

Section 8: Sustainable Development

Section 8 is best shown in the Basic Conditions Statement as this appraisal helps satisfy the requirements. SBC.

Section 8, the Council suggest a revised appraisal is undertaken to reflect the amendments highlighted in this response with particular consideration to the deletion of Objective 0. SBC 6.2.1, 7.2.14 and 8.5. As we have taken out the racecourse site is it worth removing all mention of a large sports complex? Parish Clerk

Section 9: Proposals map

8.3 Table 4 ? already too many. Mr. Maingay.

8.8/9 Kingfisher Drive was permitted to stop the then proposed Tip, with the undertaking that no more development would be allowed on that side of the A51. These proposals should therefore be taken out of the Plan. Mr. Maingay.

The Council also suggests the Proposals maps are best shown on one map. SBC

Section 10: Executive summary.

We would be grateful if a simple cross reference to the importance of the AONB to the Parish could be included in the Executive Summary, in the Environment section. AONB.

An executive summary would be helpful. 26, Cllr. Pearce.

The Council suggests the Executive summary – Section 10 is best suited at the beginning of the Neighbourhood Plan. SBC.

10. Executive Summary. Is there a standard template when drafting the Plan? Normally, when preparing reports the Executive Summary is provided at the front of the document as a summary of the salient points of the report. Andy Dunn.

Appendices.

Appendix A. It is advised that the Glossary be reviewed:

SMR (Sites and Monuments Record) is a historic term (not Scheduled Monument Record). Staffordshire County Council maintains a Historic Environment Record which is an updated SMR.

Scheduled Monument and Registered Park and Garden of Scheduled Monument and Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest are terms which require definition but are not considered within the current glossary. County Council.

Appendix D. The approach to Essex Bridge is messy at present with lots of weeds, especially nettles, on road ways and verges, which need dealing with, at little cost.

Essex Bridge and the river are tourist attractions at present but work needs to be done to tidy up the area and to make it more amenable to visitors. What would help would be improved paths and possibly some decking, walkways, picnic tables, and much better litter control with more bins. At present some locals actually go down and clear litter themselves, because the few small bins are full after a nice weekend. It would also be good to have signposts and information boards that explain the history and wildlife of the area. I have seen these things done in other areas and they look good if properly planned. Dave Robbie.

The County Council do not currently support the implementation of quiet lanes. Experience shows that they provide little benefit and are best suited to locations where pedestrian movements already far outweigh vehicle movements rather than a tool to reduce traffic flows. It is suggested that further discussion is required with the Community Highway Liaison Manager for the Parish to investigate possible alternate options to achieve objective.

Appendix E. Very informative – I've lived in the village for over 20 years and was not aware of some of this information. Andy Dunn

Appendix F. Item h) You suggest that Tixall Broadwater is in the Neighbourhood Area, i.e. the Haywoods, which it is not. Ingestre with Tixall.

The Council suggest deleting site J and to include an explanation about site K and what is a Local Wildlife Site? SBC.

Appendix G. Very informative – I've lived in the village for over 20 years and was not aware of some of this information. Andy Dunn

Appendix H. Under CP1 there is ref to the Racecourse area (just North of the Shires) and that it is not currently developable. In an earlier draft the Racecourse area was identified as possible location for a sports facility and allotments. Has this proposal been dropped ?

One of the constraints under CP1 is the location of the current HV power lines. But this did not stop the Shires development. Also, in an earlier draft, there was a proposal for (1) a new road between Roseacre Garden Centre and Mill Lane - running at the back of the Shires development; and (2) housing development between this new road and the railway line. Have these proposals been dropped ? Dave Lockett.

Appendix I. Highways. There should also be reference to a reduced speed limit between Main Rd Gt Haywood and Main Rd Colwich. This is an extremely dangerous stretch of road and changes need precede housing development and not post major accident. Dave Lockett.

Appendix I – Highway Deficiencies . Some of the assessments of the infrastructure inadequacies/deficiencies seem to be subjective rather than being based on quantitative assessment. It is suggested that further discussion is required with your Community Highway Liaison Manager to explore a way forward. County Council.

Appendix I. The potential relocation of the GP Surgery and provision of a road on the Gt Haywood side of the railway bridge in Mill Street offers several benefits; it could also exasperate the existing problems in this area, both vehicle and pedestrian, and perhaps though might be given to restricting traffic under the bridge to a single lane and providing at least one footpath. Andy Dunn

Appendix I. Get rid of the speed humps they don't stop speeding and cause more problems than they solve. They don't slow people down. I see this everyday while walking away from roseacre towards essex drive on the main road . Most people in the big cars can speed easily over them. Helen Billingsley.

What is the source for these Highway Deficiencies? Is item 2 '*Lack of overtaking lanes on A51 ...*' a deficiency? Should a third overtaking lane be provided, don't believe there is space for more without major highway work, it has the potential to create a 'coroner's corridor' leading to head-on collisions. Perhaps the way forward is to reduce speed/ability to overtake; especially if there are to be roads off the A51 into a Burial Ground and access/egress to the new housing development. Andy Dunn

Appendix K. Insert also, as 1, A51 at the Colwich end. Mr. Maingay.

Other comments.

The Council suggests for consistency to use PFSB and not PSB throughout the plan. SBC
A spell check is necessary to pick up many spelling mistakes throughout the document. SBC
Support Neighbourhood Plan 1, 3, 17, 37, 46, 51, 54, Blithfield PC. Richard Edgington

What if permission not granted for medical centre, just Mill Lane? 10,

Can people email individual councillors? 22

Help with landscaping via BKV. 25,

What a shame this was not advertised more. 28,

Lt. Tixall Lane being affected by developers. 43,

Thanks for conservation evening. 45,

The mining legacy features are predominantly mostly to the south of the River Trent and do not affect the villages within the plan area. Coal Authority.

New Housing Development

A new junction is proposed with bus stops on the A51 (I think). As I mention in the footpath note at certain times of the day you can't hear the person next to you talk on the A51 due to tyre/car noise so having a bus stop does seem impractical, as well as adding another [dangerous] junction.

This along with cars parked on one side of the road in Little Tixall Lane (between the Spar shop and The Uplands) and the narrowness of Little Tixall Lane in places will only increase the potential for accidents.

Possible solution?

A51 between Hixon turn and Wolseley bridge reduced to 40 or 30 mph.

A one way system in Great Haywood? Little Tixall Lane to become one way, with traffic going towards Marlborough Close? The current junction with Main Road is already busy, especially at rush hour/school bus pick up & drop off times. A one way system may also help the traffic flow?
Stephen Bailey