



**From:** internetforms  
**Sent:** 04 June 2019 16:18  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Internet Form: Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form  
**Attachments:** FormData.htm

A form has been submitted from the public website.

Internal Form Reference: 82089

### Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form

#### Contact details

Name	[Redacted]
Organisation (if relevant)	Hinson Parry
Address	Diamond Way Stone Business Park Stone
Postcode	ST15 0SD
Email	[Redacted]
Do you wish to be kept informed on the Council's decision on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposal?	Yes
If yes, is your preferred method of contact by email or post?	Email

#### Your response

Please state which part of the Neighbourhood Plan (for example, which section, paragraph or policy) your representation relates to:	DC2 (Sustainable Development) – Parts 2, 4 and 8 & Interpretation section
Please use the space below to provide your comments on this part of the Neighbourhood Plan:	DC2: Sustainable Design  The majority of this policy promotes a sensible approach to design. However, there is concern over how Parts 2, 4 and 8, together with some of the Interpretation section, fail to reflect national planning policy.  Part 2 requires development to enhance the character and appearance of the landscape or existing townscape. The draft plan does not define what enhancement actually means regarding design. It is relatively easy to judge

what enhancement is for certain matters, for example new needed public open space or the resurfacing of a footpath are enhancing the current situation; but design is an emotive issue with conflicting views depending on who one asks.

Paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires policies to be clearly written and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react. Whilst the policy is clearly written, the use of 'enhance' is considered to be ambiguous in the context of design and it is not evident how the decision maker should react.

Part 4 requires avoiding the appearance of over-development and over-urbanisation. Whilst in theory this concept is fine when considering development in the round but the restrictive nature fails to reflect the potential for different design approaches. For example the draft plan notes local consultation has supported 1 and 2 bed properties but this policy would prevent say a small rural-style courtyard development which would almost certainly be of a high density.

Paragraph 127(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that planning policies should ensure that developments optimise the potential of a site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development. Part 4 does not reflect because in essence it would prevent a higher density form of development if the surrounding area is of a lower density, even if it was of a high quality design. Part 3 already requires development to reflect local character in terms of height, scale and massing. This provides adequate control and therefore there is no need for Part 4 in any case, notwithstanding that it conflicts with the NPPF.

Part 8 indicates that existing verges and new green verges should be part of new development. In the majority of cases this can happen but it may not be possible every time. The NPPF recognises that plans can provide a framework for creating distinctive places but at the same time the level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances of each place and should allow a suitable degree of variety where justified. In the example of a rural-style courtyard development above, new grass verges might not be possible

but that would not take anything away from a high quality scheme.

Parts 2, 4 and 8 of the policy do not conform to the requirements of the NPPF, thus do not meet the Basic Conditions. Consequently Parts 2 and 8 need amending and Part 4 should be deleted as the issue is more successfully dealt with in Part 3.

Turning to the matter of the Interpretation of the policy, our objection relates to the section on materials. It is far too prescriptive. Although the examples of Staffordshire Blue or scalloped roof tiles will be relevant in some areas of the neighbourhood area they are not generally the local vernacular in Baldwins Gate or Whitmore.

The Interpretation section suggests that Policy DC2 would not be met by the use of poor quality imitation of traditional materials such as plastic fascias or standard concrete roof tiles. Of course poor quality materials should be avoided but part of the Design and Character Aim of the draft plan is that all new development is compatible with local built heritage and for certain areas this means the 'local built heritage' is housing development built over the last 40 years. Much of this type of housing has elements and materials of the type the neighbourhood plan seeks to prevent e.g. UPVC windows, fascias and soffits. Furthermore many of these features have been installed by their owners as a modern solution to worn out materials.

Part (c) of NPPF Paragraph 127 cautions against discouraging appropriate innovation or change whilst being sympathetic to local character and history. The references to materials in this section of the draft plan do not reflect the Basic Conditions because of the failure to have full regard to Paragraph 127 of the NPPF. UPVC is a modern long lasting material that can be utilised in many styles, as can roof tiles made of concrete. Therefore the references to plastic materials and concrete roof tiles should be deleted as it is not appropriate to restrict such materials.

**From:** internetforms  
**Sent:** 04 June 2019 16:22  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Internet Form: Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form  
**Attachments:** FormData.htm

A form has been submitted from the public website.

Internal Form Reference: 82090

## Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form

### Contact details

Name	[REDACTED]
Organisation (if relevant)	Hinson Parry
Address	Diamond Way Stone Business Park Stone
Postcode	ST15 0SD
Email	[REDACTED]
Do you wish to be kept informed on the Council's decision on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposal?	Yes
If yes, is your preferred method of contact by email or post?	Email

### Your response

Please state which part of the Neighbourhood Plan (for example, which section, paragraph or policy) your representation relates to:

Please use the space below to provide your comments on this part of the Neighbourhood Plan:

Policy DC3 - Interpretation.

DC3: Public Realm and Car Parking

Our concern is not with DC3 per se but with the conflict between its wording and that of the Interpretation section. The latter suggests that parking mix should comprise garage and parking space. On face value this could be interpreted by a decision maker as each new house has to have a garage. This is not reflected in the policy itself, in further parts of the Interpretation section or in the Baldwins Gate Design Statement contained within the draft plan. All of these recognise that a garage

is not always part of the parking provision for a new house and this needs to be made clear in the policy's Interpretation as well.

**From:** internetforms  
**Sent:** 04 June 2019 16:27  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Internet Form: Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form  
**Attachments:** FormData.htm

A form has been submitted from the public website.

Internal Form Reference: 82091

## Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form

### Contact details

Name	[REDACTED]
Organisation (if relevant)	Hinson Parry
Address	Diamond Way Stone Business Park Stone
Postcode	ST15 0SD
Email	[REDACTED]
Do you wish to be kept informed on the Council's decision on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposal?	Yes
If yes, is your preferred method of contact by email or post?	Email

### Your response

Please state which part of the Neighbourhood Plan (for example, which section, paragraph or policy) your representation relates to:	Policy DC6
Please use the space below to provide your comments on this part of the Neighbourhood Plan:	DC6: Housing Standards  Our concern is with Part 2 of the policy. There is no objection to sustainable drainage systems as this is the correct approach but the different elements do depend on various factors including ground conditions and topography.  Part 2 requires permeable surfaces in hard landscape areas but if the ground is not suitable for infiltration this is not an option. That is not to say that sustainable drainage methods cannot be employed in such circumstances e.g. use of

an attenuation pond to store water before release into the drainage system, but for permeable paving to be used the water needs to be able to enter the soil to avoid run-off.

Policy NE2 already addresses sustainable drainage and therefore Part 2 of DC6 is not required and should be deleted.



**From:** internetforms  
**Sent:** 04 June 2019 16:03  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Internet Form: Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form  
**Attachments:** FormData.htm

A form has been submitted from the public website.

Internal Form Reference: 82088

### Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Consultation Representation Form

#### Contact details

Name	[Redacted]
Organisation (if relevant)	Hinson Parry & Company
Address	Diamond Way Stone Business Park Stone
Postcode	ST15 0SD
Email	[Redacted]
Do you wish to be kept informed on the Council's decision on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposal?	Yes
If yes, is your preferred method of contact by email or post?	Email

#### Your response

Please state which part of the Neighbourhood Plan (for example, which section, paragraph or policy) your representation relates to:	Policy NE1.
Please use the space below to provide your comments on this part of the Neighbourhood Plan:	NE1: Natural Environment  We suggest that it is disingenuous of the draft plan to suggest that all of the neighbourhood area is of a special rural character. Certainly there are many parts of the neighbourhood area that are rural but there are some areas, principally in Baldwins Gate / Whitmore, where the dominating development style is 1970s and 1980s suburban housing. These include Sandyfields, Meadow Way and Lakeside Close in Baldwins Gate; and Appleton Drive and Snape Hall Close in Whitmore.



Rather than reference 'special rural character' the policy should refer to the 'character' of the area as this will address both rural and suburban parts; because there are numerous examples around Baldwins Gate and Whitmore where suburban development does interface with the countryside. This change would then reflect the fact that the policy on sustainable design (DC2) refers to both local landscape and townscape.