

**Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan
Consultation Statement
Date 5th August 2021**

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Summary of Community Engagement	4
2.1 Approach to community engagement	4
2.2 What was done?	4
2.3 Who was targeted?	12
2.4 Outcomes/Feedback	12
3. Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)	15
3.1 How the Consultation Was Undertaken	15
3.2 Statutory Consultees	16
3.3 Issues	24
4. Responses to Representations	25

1. Introduction

This Consultation Statement accompanies the submission of the Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2037. It summarises the community engagement programme and the Regulation 14 consultation that were undertaken. It shows how the requirements of Regulations 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) have been satisfied.

2. Summary of Community Engagement

2.1 Approach to community engagement

Madeley Parish Council developed a programme of community and stakeholder engagement which has been used to guide the process of producing the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Parish Council recognises that the Neighbourhood Development Plan must reflect the needs of the community and the locality.

Accordingly, the Parish Council has sought to communicate with residents in a timely and effective manner and to inform and actively engage with them throughout the process of producing the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The community engagement carried out in producing the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan is summarised in the community engagement table, found on the following pages.



2.2 What was done?

To achieve the varied community engagement the Parish Council has used a wide range of communication methods including open meetings, a dedicated website (www.madeleynp.org), stand at village events, social media such as the Facebook page, the Madeley Conservation Group newsletter and two large banners at prominent positions in the village. In addition, specially printed questionnaires were circulated to all households in the parish at the detailed community consultation stage.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan has undertaken the following statutory consultation as part of the process:

- Publicity of the Neighbourhood Area
- Pre-submission consultation

- Publicity following submission (to be done by Local Planning Authority)



Initial consultations and publicity were carried out for the Neighbourhood Development Plan at the start of the process between May and September 2017. This involved an initial brief questionnaire, three workshops held in the Madeley Centre which were open to all residents and various forms of publicity to the community. This enabled the later comprehensive questionnaire in January 2018, to focus on, confirm and expand upon, the key issues identified previously.

The following table illustrates the non-statutory community and stakeholder engagement undertaken as part of the evidence gathering and Neighbourhood Development Plan process, used to inform, shape and scope the plan.

Date	Method/Action	Purpose
April 2017	Establish the NP Steering Group made up of Parish Councillors and local residents.	To enable a programme of community engagement to inform, scope and shape of the NP.
May 2017	Establish website (www.madeleynp.org)	To publicise the development of the Neighbourhood Plan process and keep local residents and interested parties informed of progress.
June - September 2017	Initial community questionnaire. Attendance at various village events including Madeley Festival, Dog show	To identify residents and stakeholders initial views on key issues to help shape priorities.

	<p>and HS2 roadshow. Three days of Neighbourhood Plan Roadshows held in the Madeley Centre open to all residents.</p> <p>Publicity in the Parish Council Newsletter, Madeley Conservation Group Newsletter and on social media.</p>	To publicise the development of the Plan and initial questionnaire.
October - November 2017	Analysis of community feedback from initial questionnaire and events.	To identify priorities and to focus the next phase of activity.
November - December 2017	Preparation of comprehensive questionnaire based on the findings of initial feedback and plan to maximise response from community and stakeholders.	To ensure the detailed questionnaire covers the priorities previously identified and all other important issues.
January 2018	Detailed community consultation exercise including distribution of 1,800 comprehensive questionnaires, one to every household in the Neighbourhood Plan area with pre-paid envelope for response and a version of the questionnaire on the website to allow online submission.	To gain detailed information from the community on important issues and priorities identified at the earlier consultation.

	<p>Publicity to maximise response rate including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large banners at prominent positions in the village. • Stand and post box at Madeley Centre throughout the consultation period. • On the www.madeleynp.org website • Social media posts by Simon White (Borough and Parish Councillor and Mayor) • Promoted in the Madeley Conservation Group newsletter 	
February - March 2018	Analysis of the detailed community consultation questionnaire.	<p>The data has been analysed and the findings used to inform the writing of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The response rate was very positive with 785 questionnaires completed during the consultation period.</p>
April – May 2018	<p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>The Parish Council Clerk wrote to stakeholders inviting their input and comments.</p>	To obtain input and feedback from stakeholders to inform the writing of the Neighbourhood Plan.

<p>April – July 2018</p>	<p>Local Green Space audit.</p>	<p>Community consultation identified that local green spaces are very important and many were nominated for assessment against the NPPF criteria.</p> <p>An audit of each of the suggested sites was performed against the original NPPF 77 and updated NPPF 100 criteria to identify sites that are appropriate for potential designation as a Local Green Space.</p>
	<p>Local Green Space consultation.</p> <p>The Clerk wrote to all landowners and occupiers of sites identified for potential designation as Local Green Spaces to invite their comment.</p> <p>There was a display and information about the potential Local Green Spaces at the Madeley Centre and shown on the website throughout the consultation period.</p> <p>Detailed meetings were also held with Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council to ensure the policy and</p>	<p>To obtain comments and feedback about the designation of sites as Local Green Spaces from landowners, occupiers, users, the community and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council.</p>

	<p>proposed designations did not conflict, and worked with, their emerging local plan.</p>	
<p>October 2018 to January 2019</p>	<p>Analysis and Further Review of Local Green Spaces</p> <p>The consultation responses were reviewed and analysed to identify potential changes to proposed Local Green Spaces designation.</p> <p>This review identified that it was necessary to update the Local Green Spaces to address responses that raised relevant issues including the removal of 7 sites which were reclassified as Recreation, Leisure, Play and Sports Facilities.</p>	<p>To ensure that proposed Local Green Space designations are appropriate and reflect relevant issues identified by comments from landowners, occupiers, users and the community.</p>
<p>January – February 2019</p>	<p>Madeley Parish Council appointed an Independent Examiner (Nigel McGurk) to perform a ‘health check’ with emphasis on the Local Green Spaces policy, proposed designations and evidence base.</p> <p>The examiner was provided with everything he requested including the draft plan, local green space audit</p>	<p>Local Green Spaces have been consistently identified as being very important to the community. Therefore, it was considered appropriate to appoint an experienced examiner to perform a ‘health check’ and policy review of the proposed LGS to ensure the policy was appropriate and the proposed designations robustly met all criteria.</p>

	<p>work and responses to the first Local Green Spaces consultation.</p> <p>He issued a detailed report in February 2019 which contained recommended changes. All recommended changes were accepted, and the draft Plan and Local Green Spaces policy was updated accordingly. Subject to these changes, he concluded that all proposed Local Green Space designations met the criteria and were appropriate.</p>	
<p>August – September 2019</p>	<p>Second consultation on Local Green Space following updates as a result of the first consultation.</p> <p>The Clerk wrote to all landowners and occupiers of sites identified for potential designation as Local Green Spaces to invite their comment.</p> <p>A display and information about the potential Local Green Spaces to be shown at the Madeley Centre and shown on the website throughout the consultation period.</p>	<p>To obtain comments and feedback about the revised designation of sites as Local Green Spaces from landowners, occupiers, users, the community and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council.</p>

	<p>A detailed meeting was also held with Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council to ensure the policy and proposed designations do not conflict, and worked with, their emerging local plan.</p>	
<p>12th February 2020 to 25th March 2020</p>	<p>Formal consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan took place from Wednesday 12th February 2020 at 12 noon to Wednesday 25th March 2020 at 12 noon in accordance with Regulation-14, Town and Country Planning, England Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulation 2012. This was a six-week statutory consultation period.</p>	<p>Regulation-14 Consultation</p>

2.3 Who was targeted?

To achieve the varied community engagement the Parish Council has used a wide range of communication methods including open meetings, a dedicated website (www.madeleynp.org), stand at village events, social media such as the Facebook page, the Madeley Conservation Group newsletter and two large banners at prominent positions in the village. In addition, specially printed questionnaires were circulated to all households in the parish at the detailed community consultation stage.

2.4 Outcomes/Feedback

Initial consultations and publicity were carried out for the Neighbourhood Development Plan at the start of the process between May and September 2017. This involved an initial brief questionnaire, three workshops held in the Madeley Centre which were open to all residents and various forms of publicity to the community. This enabled the later comprehensive questionnaire in January 2018, to focus on, confirm and expand upon, the key issues identified previously. The results of the questionnaire informed the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan. A report showing an analysis of the results was made available on the website at the following link:

<https://www.madeleynp.org/app/download/12196518399/Madeley+Neighbourhood+Plan+Questionnaire+Analysis+Report.pdf>

As a result of the community engagement the key issues and themes for the Neighbourhood Development Plan were identified and from these the vision and aims were formed. Below is a SWOT analysis of the main issues raised through the process.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rural character of the parish• Green and open spaces• Sense of community	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of sports and recreation facilities

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area and historic buildings including Grade 1 listed Church and churchyard • Facilities including Madeley Centre, GP surgery, good local schools and shops. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Monument junction is dangerous and unable to cope with volume of traffic • Speed of traffic and pedestrian safety • Poor road and pavement maintenance • Visual impact and noise pollution from M6 motorway and railway
<p>Opportunities</p>	<p>Threats</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard rural character and local green spaces • Preserve and enhance the heritage and historic buildings • Encourage sustainable development according to evidenced need in appropriate locations with good design • Increase and improve sports and recreation facilities • Facilitate improvements to Monument junction • Identify suitable measures to manage/calm traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to the area caused by HS2 including construction phase resulting in decline in the area • Existing facilities are at or approaching capacity so unable to cope with new developments • Development resulting in loss of important rural views or in or near the conservation area damaging the character of the area.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create a mix of housing types – affordable, family homes and bungalows. | |
|---|--|

3. Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

3.1 How the Consultation Was Undertaken

Formal consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan took place from Wednesday 12th February 2020 at 12 noon to Wednesday 25th March 2020 at 12 noon in accordance with Regulation-14, Town and Country Planning, England Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulation 2012. This was a six-week statutory consultation period.

The consultation was widely publicised including the following:

- Poster were placed in local shops, pubs and dentist providing details of the consultation and how the plan could be viewed and responded to.
- The plan was available to download together with a consultation form on the Madeley NP website at www.madeleynp.org/regulation-14-consultation
- In the Madeley group newsletter that was delivered to all houses in the neighbourhood area
- Statutory consultees were written to by post and/or email (see list in the next section)
- Hard copies of the plan together with details about the consultation process and response forms were on display to view and respond at The Madeley Centre, Madeley Doctors Surgery waiting room and Newcastle Library in the Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council building at Castle House
- Madeley Parish Council supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held events at the Madeley Centre where the plan can could be viewed be viewed on Monday 17th February 2020 from 6.30 to 7.30pm, Thursday 27th February 2020 from 1.30 to 2.30pm and prior to the Madeley Parish Council meeting on Thursday 5th March 2020 at 6.30pm

The majority of the consultation period including all community drop in events were prior to the first UK Covid lockdown restrictions. Responses were invited by various methods - by email to info@madeleynp.org, by post to Clerk to Madeley Parish Council, 10 Freebridge Close, Longton, Stoke-on-Trent, ST3 5XQ or by hand delivery to The Madeley Centre.

3.2 Statutory Consultees

The following statutory consultees provided by Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council were consulted:

Organisation	Address	Email address
LOCAL AUTHORITIES		
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council	Civic Offices, Merrial Street, Newcastle-under-Lyme, ST5 2AG	planningpolicy@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk
Staffordshire County Council	Wedgwood Building, Block A, Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2DH	planning@staffordshire.gov.uk
Staffordshire County Council Highways	2 Staffordshire Place, Tipping Street, Stafford ST16 2DH	transportdcnewcastle@staffordshire.gov.uk
NEIGHBOURING LOCAL AUTHORITIES		
Cheshire East Borough Council	Spatial Planning Team, Cheshire East Borough Council, Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach CW11 1HZ	localplan@cheshireeast.gov.uk
Shropshire Council	Shropshire Council, Planning Policy & Strategy Team Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND	planning.policy@shropshire.gov.uk
Stafford Borough Council	Forward Planning, Stafford Borough Council, Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford, ST16 3AQ	forwardplanning@staffordbc.gov.uk
Stoke on Trent City Council	Planning Policy, Civic Centre, Glebe	localplan@stoke.gov.uk

Street, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 1HH

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Regeneration Manager, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek ST13 6HQ

forward.plans@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk

PARISH COUNCILS

Audley Rural Parish Council

Mrs C Withington - Clerk to Audley Parish Council

audleyparishcouncil@hotmail.co.uk

The Croft, Barthomley Road, Audley, Stoke on Trent, ST7 8HU

Betley, Balterley & Wrinehill Parish Council

Mr G Griffiths - Clerk to Betley, Balterley and Wrinehill Parish Council
18 Holly Mount, Basford, Crewe, Cheshire, CW2 5AZ

griffiths725@btinternet.com

Chapel and Hill Chorlton Parish Council

Mrs N Hassall - Clerk to Chapel and Hill Chorlton Parish Council

nestahassall@hotmail.com

Keele Parish Council

Mrs C Withington - Clerk to Keele Parish Council

clerk.keelepc@gmail.com

The Croft, Barthomley Road, Audley, Stoke on Trent, ST7 8HU

Kidsgrove Town Council

Clerk to Kidsgrove Town Council, Town Hall, Kidsgrove, Stoke-on-Trent, ST7 4EL

kidsgrovetc@btconnect.com (rejected)
Resent on
admin@kidsgrovetowncouncil.gov.uk

Loggerheads Parish Council

c/o Loggerheads Community Fire

loggerheadspc@btconnect.com

Station, Market Drayton Road,
Loggerheads, TF9 4EZ

Madeley Parish Council

Mrs J Simpson - Clerk to Madeley
Parish Council, 10 Freebridge Close,
Longton, Stoke on Trent, ST3 5QX

parish.clerk@madeley.staffslc.gov.uk

Maer & Aston Parish Council

Elena Sudlow - Clerk to Maer Parish
Council
The Garden House, Maer, Newcastle,
ST5 5EF

maeraston@hotmail.com

Silverdale Parish Council

Mrs C Withington - Clerk to Keele
Parish Council
The Croft, Barthomley Road, Audley,
Stoke on Trent, ST7 8HU

clerk.keelepc@gmail.com

Whitmore Parish Council

Mrs W Kinson - Clerk to Whitmore
Parish Council
The Old Laundry, Maer, Newcastle-
under-Lyme, ST5 5EF

wendykinson@tiscali.co.uk (rejected)
Resent to
Parish.clerk@whitmoreparishcouncil.
co.uk

NEIGHBOURING PARISH COUNCILS

Alsager Town Council

Alsager Town Council, 3 Lawton
Road, Alsager, Cheshire, ST7 2AE

admin@Alsagertowncouncil.org.uk

Weston & Basford Parish Council

Weston Basford Parish Council,
Chapel Cottage Englesea Brook,
Crewe, CW2 5QW

clovelly@davidgeorgeowen.plus.com

Odd Rode Parish Council

The Parish Office, Newfield House,
Brook Lane, Astbury, Cheshire, CW12
4TJ

clerk@oddrode.org.uk

Doddington & District Parish Council	Parish Clerk, 185 Alton Street, Crewe, CW2 7PU	mail@doddingtonpc.co.uk
Hough and Chorlton Parish Council	Rose Villa, Foden Avenue, Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent, ST7 2PT	houghparishcncd@btinternet.com (rejected) resent to clerk@houghandchorlton.co.uk
Norton in Hales Parish Council	Laurel House, 12 Pemberton Close, Ightfield, Whitchurch SY13 4BF	nortoninhalespc@yahoo.co.uk (rejected) resent to nortoninhalespc@outlook.com
Market Drayton Town Council	18 Frogmore Road, Market Drayton, Shropshire, TF9 3AX	townclerk@marketdrayton.gov.uk
Sutton upon Tern Parish Council	Woodseaves, Market Drayton, Shropshire, TF9	suttonparishcouncil@hotmail.co.uk
Cheswardine Parish Council		cheswardineparishcouncil@hotmail.com
Standon Parish Council		standonpcclerk@yahoo.co.uk
Swynnerton Parish Council		lizharringtonjones@hotmail.co.uk
Biddulph Parish Council	Biddulph Town Council, Town Hall, High Street, Biddulph, Staffordshire ST8 6AR	biddulph@staffordshire.gov.uk
Eccleshall Parish Council	Eccleshall Parish Council, 16, Newport Road, Great Bridgeford, Stafford, ST18 9PR	eccleshallpc@gmail.com

Woore Parish Council	Woore Parish Council, North Barn, Church House, Farm, Coole Lane, Nantwich, CW5 8AB	clerk@wooreparishcouncil.org
Church Lawton Parish Council	Church Lawton Parish Council, c/o Rose Villa Foden Avenue, Alsager, ST7 2PT	CLparishclerk@gmail.com
CONSULTATION BODIES		
The Coal Authority	Planning And Local Authority Liaison, 200 Lichfield Lane Berry Hill, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, NG18 4RG	planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk
Homes and Communities Agency	Homes and Communities Agency, Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF	mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk
Natural England	Consultation Service, Hornbeam House, Electra Way Crewe Business Park, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 6GJ	Consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
Environment Agency	Environment Agency, Sentinel House, 9 Wellington Crescent, Fradley Park, Lichfield, WS13 8RR	swwmplanning@environment- agency.gov.uk
Historic England	The Axis, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1TG	west.midlands@historicengland.org.uk (rejected) resent to e- midlands@historicengland.org.uk
Network Rail	Town Planning Team LNW, Desk 122 - Floor 1, Square One, 4 Travis Street,	TownPlanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk

Manchester, M1 2NY

Highways England

Network Strategy West Midlands,
Highways Agency C3 5 Broadway, Broad
Street, Birmingham, B15 1BL

PlanningWM@highways.gsi.gov.uk

Marine Management Organisation

consultations.mmo@marinemanagement.org.uk

**ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS
CODE OPERATORS**

EE Ltd (EE, Orange & T Mobile)

Trident Place, Hatfield Business Park,
Mosquito Way, Hatfield, Hertfordshire
AL10 9BW

Cornerstone Telecommunications
Infrastructure Limited
(Vodafone UK & Telefonica UK)

The Exchange, Building 1330, Arlington
Business Park, Theale, Berkshire, RG7
4SA

emf.enquiries@ctil.co.uk

British Telecommunications Plc

81, Newgate Street, London, EC1A 7AJ

Hutchinson 3G Ltd

Star House, 20 Grenfell Road,
Maidenhead SL6 1EH

PRIMARY CARE TRUST

North Staffordshire Clinical
Commissioning Group

Morston House, The Midway, Newcastle-
under-Lyme, ST5 1QG

UTILITIES

Western Power Distribution	Western Power Distribution, Toll End Road, Tipton DY4 0HH	
National Grid	Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK, Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire CV32 6JX	n.grid@amecfw.com (rejected) resent to nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com
National Grid	National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA	box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com
SP Energy Networks	SP Energy Networks, Data Management (England and Wales), Prenton Way, Prenton, CH43 3ET	requestforplansmanweb@sppowersystems.com
Energetics Electricity	Fenick House, Lister Way, Hamilton International Technology Park Glasgow, G72 0FT	Site.midlands@energetics-uk.com
Cadent Gas	Block 1, Floor 1, Brick Kiln Street, Hinckley, LE10 0NA	plantprotection@cadentgas.com
Severn Trent Water	Operations Management, Asset Protection (Waste Water) West Regis Road, Tettenhall, Wolverhampton, WV6 8RU	growth.development@severntrent
United Utilities	External Planning Liaison, Ground Floor, Thirlmere House, Ingley Mere, Liverpool Road, Lingley Green Avenue, Warrington, WA5 3LP	planning.liaison@uuplc.co.uk

VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS ETC

Saltbox	Bemersley House, Gitana Street, Hanley, Stoke On Trent, Staffordshire, ST1 1DY	email@saltbox.org.uk (rejected) resent to kim@saltbox.org.uk
Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce	Commerce House, Festival Park, Stoke On Trent, ST1 5BE	info@staffordshirechambers.co.uk
Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership	No 1 Staffordshire Place, Stafford, ST16 2DH	contactus@stokestaffslep.org.uk and julie.frost@staffordshire.gov.uk
Disability Solutions	North Staffordshire Medical Institute, Hartshill Road, Stoke-on-Trent ST4 7NY	general@disability-solutions.net
OPEN (Older Peoples Engagement Network)	Bemersley House, Gitana Street, Hanley, Stoke On Trent, Staffordshire, ST1 1DY	open@saltbox.org.uk
Newcastle Rural LAP	c/o Irene Lee,	irene.lee@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk
Support Staffordshire	Support Staffordshire (Staffordshire Moorlands), Bank House, St Edward Street, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 5DS	Staffordshiremoorlands@supportstaffordsh ire.org.uk
Age UK North Staffordshire	83-85 Trinity Street, Hanley, Stoke-on- Trent ST1 5NA	info@ageuknorthstaffs.org.uk
Age UK	Age UK, Tavis House, 1-6 Tavistock Square, London WC1H 9NA	contact@ageuk.org.uk
Interfaith Network	2 Grosvenor Gardens, London, SW1W 0DH	ifnet@interfaith.org.uk

Community Council of Staffordshire	Suite 1A/1B The Whitehouse, 3A Chapel Street, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST16 2BX	communitycouncil@staffs.org.uk
------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

**OTHER
CONSULTEES**

Sport England		planning.central@sportengland.org
---------------	--	-----------------------------------

Canals and Rivers Trust	Canal & River Trust, Red Bull Wharf, Congleton Road South, Church Lawton, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, ST7 3AP	customer.services@canalrivertrust.org.uk
-------------------------	--	--

HS2	HS2 Limited, Two Snowhill, Snowhill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA	HS2Enquiries@hs2.org.uk
-----	---	-------------------------

Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service	Pirehill, Stone, Staffordshire, ST15 0BS	webmaster@staffordshirefire.gov.uk
---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

Staffordshire Police	Staffordshire Police Headquarters, PO Box 3167 Stafford, ST16 9JZ	
----------------------	---	--

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust	The Wolseley Centre, Wolseley Bridge, Stafford, ST17 0WT	info@staffs-wildlife.org.uk
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

3.3 Issues

The main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted and how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in modifications to the proposed neighbourhood development plan are set out in the next part of this statement.

4. Responses to Representations

A. National and Statutory Bodies

Sport England Email 17 February 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates.</p> <p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document. https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.</p>	<p>General comments noted</p> <p>Comments about the promotion of healthy lifestyles is noted. Our proposed LGS and Community facilities and Design policies seek to promote healthy and active lifestyle.</p> <p>Check the active design principles against the DES1 policy and where relevant consider amendments</p>	<p>Add to DES1: New bullet point to read ‘Development must provide connections to surrounding footpaths and a permeable layout to allow easy safe and convenient pedestrian movement.’</p>

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.
<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.
<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to

<p>existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p>		
--	--	--

Natural England Letter by Email 18 February 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Comments noted	No action required.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.		
--	--	--

Severn Trent Letter by Email 10 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>Position Statement As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.</p> <p>Sewage Strategy Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.</p> <p>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing</p>	<p>Comments noted. The plan already includes a policy on sustainable drainage and permeable surfaces in policy DES1 Design.</p> <p>Comments noted about the infrastructure and potential growth strategy.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.

We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers.

To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website

<https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/>

Water Quality

Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency.

Water Supply

When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts.

We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.

Water Efficiency

Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.

We recommend that in all cases you consider:

- Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.
- Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.
- Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less.
- Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.

To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website

<https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/>

We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.

Historic England Letter by Email 13 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>Historic England has no adverse comments to make upon the draft plan which we feel takes a suitably proportionate approach to the main historic environment issues pertaining to Madeley.</p> <p>We commend the commitment in the Plans Vision and Policies to support development that is sensitive and sympathetic to the character of the area including its rural landscape character and green spaces.</p>	Comments noted.	No action required.

National Grid Letter by Email 20 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates.</p> <p>Letter stated that an assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	Comments noted.	No action required.

SP Energy Networks Email 12 February 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates.</p> <p>We have one oversailing 132kv cable but the Neighbourhood Plan has no impact.</p>	Comments noted.	No action required.

Coal Authority Letter by Email 23 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates.</p> <p>The Coal Authority records indicate that there are coal mining legacy features present in the Neighbourhood Plan area defined. These include; mine entries, recorded and likely unrecorded coal workings, past surface mining activity and recorded surface hazards.</p> <p>I have reviewed the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and note that in this case it does not propose any site allocations for new development. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.</p>	Comments noted.	No action required.

Marine Management Email 12 February 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
No objections or suggested updates.	Comments noted.	No action required.

Network Rail Email 12 February 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates.</p> <p>Developments in the neighbourhood area should be notified to Network Rail to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area. (b) That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage works / water features • Encroachment of land or air-space 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Network Rail has asked to be informed about applications. This is a local authority action, Network Rail's comments will be sent to the LPA.</p>	No action required.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavation works • Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues • Lighting impacting upon train drivers' ability to perceive signals • Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments • Any piling works • Any scaffolding works • Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949) • Any use of crane or plant • Any fencing works • Any demolition works • Any hard standing areas 		
---	--	--

B. Local Authorities and Parish Councils

Loggerheads Parish Council Email 19 February 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates.</p> <p>Congratulations to all involved, I know how much work has been involved to get to this stage. Your plan looks very professional, covers the right policies and I am impressed you have got it down to 57 pages.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Woore Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Email 16 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>As we share with you a (smaller) part of Onneley, we were surprised that in your list of sporting facilities in the Parish you made no mention of its Golf Course, although Onneley Cricket Club is mentioned.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>We also noted that though in several places you refer to the impact of HS2 unlike us you have not attempted to include a policy on which residents could vote.</p>	<p>The HS2 comments are noted. It is national infrastructure and outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group From Sent by Email 20 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>No objections or suggested updates</p> <p>It was noted that the plan and various policies has strategic importance for residents of the Chapel and Hill Chorlton, Maer and Aston, and Whitmore as a neighbouring area but no objections or suggested edits to any policy. It was also noted that the it is clear and concise.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Staffordshire County Council Letter Dated 24 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
<p>Education</p> <p>There are three schools located in Madeley, Sir John Offley CE (VC) Primary, The Meadows Primary and Madeley High School.</p>	<p>Education:</p> <p>Comments noted about education and provision.</p>	<p>HOU1: Update wording to read 'Within the Madeley village envelope and</p>

<p>As a result of new housing development in the catchment of Madeley High School consideration is now being given to a 150 place expansion (1Form Entry) at the school. This is in its early discussion stages and not yet proceeded to formal consultation or planning application. It should be noted that the school has a detached playing field (situated away from the school) which is accounted for in the total site area of the school and owned by Staffordshire County Council. It should be acknowledged that following the above project there will limited/no growth opportunities at the three schools on their current sites; it would be beneficial if School Organisation were consulted in advance of proposed numbers of housing in Madeley and the wider catchment of Madeley High School.</p> <p>It is noted that the detached playing field for Madeley High School is proposed for designation as a Local Green Space (LGS2) along with the adjacent children's playground. Whilst the Playground fits the requirements for a LGS it is felt that the designation is unnecessary for the detached playing field for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As school playing field the land already has significant protection against development. Loss of playing field is protected in National Planning Policy via Sport England and secondly via the Department for Education as set out in Schedule 1 of the Academies Act 2010 ("AA 2010") and Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 ("SSFA 1998"), which require approval of the Secretary of State prior to disposal or change of use of school playing fields. 2. As noted above there is a present need to extend Madeley High School and limited ability, if any, to expand either of the local primary schools. The detached playing field potentially offers opportunity across all phases of education in the village to provide additional secondary school curriculum space and as it sits centrally in the village and also between the two existing primary schools there may be possibility to consider it for additional primary school provision. <p>The designation of the field as a LGS will therefore affect the ability to deliver education facilities for the village and therefore the part of LGS2 that is owned by the County Council is not supported and should be removed from the LGS designation.</p>	<p>Further clarity to be provided to HOU1 to define the level of growth for new housing. The policy should be tightened to ensure it is modest levels of growth.</p> <p>LGS2: Has a demonstrably special value to the community and has been through extensive consultation and independent review. No action required.</p>	<p>Madeley Heath village envelope (see plans on the following page Madeley Village Envelope and Madeley Heath Village Envelope, both shown edged in orange);</p> <p>Updated with individual maps showing the two village envelopes with no other markings provided by NULBC.</p>
--	---	--

<p>In order to further safeguard future education provision in Madeley consideration should be given to opportunities to increase the size of the High School site, which could facilitate an increase of capacity at the High school and could also facilitate a new primary school.</p>		
<p>Transport Whilst the Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan details the location of proposed residential sites in and around Madeley, Staffordshire County Council is aware of significant residential and employment development proposed in and around Keele in the emerging Joint Local Plan being prepared by Newcastle-Under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent City Councils. Some of the traffic generated by and attracted to this development is likely to pass through this junction. Highway improvements may well be needed to mitigate any adverse impacts from this additional traffic. We are aware of the community position on the junction as set out on page 42 of the Plan under 'Non planning issues' however we cannot be restricted to the single option currently favoured by the local community. Staffordshire County Council as Highway Authority will need to consider the full range of engineering options to preserve capacity and safety.</p>	<p>Transport The purpose of the monument junction comments in the non-planning issues section are to relay the evidence gathered and concerns raised during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Madeley Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss with Staffordshire County Highways at relevant stages on any proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Comments noted. No action required.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council Letter by Email 25 March 2020

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Modification to the NDP
General Comments	General Comments:	

<p>The Borough Council recognise the effort taken by Madeley Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in reaching an important milestone in the plan making process. The Council also would like to thank the Steering Group for engaging with the Council on the Neighbourhood Plan as it has developed. The Neighbourhood Plan has had the benefit of a 'health check' by an Independent Examiner (Nigel McGurk). The Plan records a wide range of mechanisms of engagement with the community (pages 12-15). Both processes will have aided the production of the Plan and conformity with the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Madeley Neighbourhood Plan has identified some key issues affecting the Parish on page 16 and has produced a set of aims to address these on page 5 and identified some non-planning issues on page 42. The scope of some of the issues with respect to housing affordability, specific transport issues, supporting services and facilities and encouraging sustainable development will also warrant consideration as to mechanisms to address these issues in the emerging Local Plan. The Council are keen to develop and maintain a close working relationship with Madeley Parish Council to ensure issues are addressed and that both Plans are produced in general conformity with each other.</p> <p>The Plan in general is well structured, informative and concise which makes it easy to read. In some cases the 'Interpretation' sections could be more detailed, which has been noted in the detailed commentary table overleaf. For most policies, further information could be provided on how the policies are expected to be interpreted and therefore implemented.</p>	<p>Comments noted, no action required.</p>	
<p>Page 9 – Heritage</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan provides a platform for attention to be given to how the various heritage assets inter-relate. The more narrative that can either be supplied in the plan or cross –referenced e.g. Historic England records, so the importance of each assets can be appreciated together with the space around them. This can be especially useful when assessing proposals that may affect the setting of the buildings. It would also prove beneficial to understand how the space between assets</p>	<p>Heritage: Comments noted, a generic heritage policy will be inconsequential due to existing policy requirements and special statutory duties relating to</p>	<p>DES2: Update text to read 'Development proposals must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.</p>

<p>is uses either for formal recreation, to provide open vistas, frame other development forms, facilitate public/ wildlife access etc. Counter to this, there is a danger that the Plan could become a heritage statement and focus is lost on the wider policy framework.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Further supporting text to identify the linkages between the heritage assets which have a central role in defining the character of the Parish. Consider a specific heritage policy to provide additional weight.</p>	<p>listed buildings and conservation areas.</p> <p>There is also a risk that a generalised policy could replace more detailed requirements in local plan policy.</p> <p>Update DES2 to make clear the special duties.</p> <p>Ask NULBC if there is anything more specific that could be added to the policy too.</p>	<p>Development must take account of important views identified on Map DES2 Locally Important Views and listed below:</p> <p>View A...'</p>
<p>Page 16 SWOT Analysis On matters where there are established methodologies for assessing impact of new development, care needs to be taken in quantifying the degree of harm that already exists or could be generated by new development. Notably, under the Weaknesses section, comment is made that the Monument junction is dangerous and in in the Threats section, it is stated that existing facilities are at or approaching capacity. Evidence will be needed to substantiate these comments if they are to form the basis of new policy which in turn may be exposed to challenge at a planning inquiry.] Furthermore, with regard to the comment on the Monument junction, clarity is required to explain if the concerns about the ability of the junction to cope with a volume of traffic relate to the current situation or an anticipated increase in the future.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Either a. secure additional evidence to support the statements made or b. phrase the concerns in a manner which highlights the issue and the necessity for further investigation probably through the assessment of a planning application.</p>	<p>Comments noted, these are outcomes of engagement.</p> <p>Care is required to ensure that this is an accurate reporting of community engagement.</p> <p>No action required.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

<p>Page 19 EU Obligations - In response to the UK Governments withdrawal from the EU in January, this section will need to be kept under review to ensure it reflects the up to date obligations on this Country.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Monitor national legislation during the plan creation period.</p>	<p>Comments noted, there is an equivalence in UK Law the examiner will clarify this.</p> <p>No action required.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>Page 21 Local Green Space Designation The Borough Council does not object to any of the proposed LGS sites.</p> <p>The Borough Council provided comment on a draft version of Policy LGS (previously CF1) on 16th August 2019. The full response is provided in Appendix 1 for information. The Neighbourhood Planning Group have further corresponded with the Council and provided a written response to these points, however, some points remain relevant.</p> <p>There is very limited reference to the Green Belt within the Neighbourhood Plan. It would benefit the Examiner to explicitly outline why the Parish Council has sought to designate some Local Green Spaces which are also designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>Whilst the Neighbourhood Planning Group have provided descriptive information on the reasoning for designation of all proposed Local Green Spaces, it would be helpful to be explicit about the significance of LGS1 as a whole site, particularly in recognition of the fact that part of the site is an agricultural field. If only part of the site was designated as an LGS, would the value of the space diminish? If so, why?</p> <p>It may be helpful to specify the % of respondents who supported each designation for additional justification, as has been done for LGS 1.</p> <p>In addition, it would assist to understand how the proposed LGS is to be used. Whilst there are public rights of way across some of the sites, is the intention for access rights</p>	<p>Comments noted, action to strengthen references to the green belt as suggested.</p> <p>Whilst LGS has similar protection to green belt, it should be noted that the purpose of LGS is protecting the special community value, and not the 5 purposes of green belts.</p> <p>The comments on suggested actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Agree, no action required. 2) Check evidence is adequate. 3) See the evidence report. 4) The evidence document makes clear what the land is used for. 	<p>The descriptions have been updated to reference to green belt in the plan.</p>

<p>to be expanded to the whole of the designated area or constrained to the identified routes. Clarification on this point will be useful for understanding the possible value of the space in meeting recreation and play needs. For example, would these designations support the development of a skate park close to a boundary?</p> <p>Suggestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council to confirm what additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space to Green Belt sites. • In terms of LGS01 additional evidence should be provided to demonstrate to the examiner that the agricultural field, located on the eastern side of the proposed LGS, meets the relevant criteria within paragraph 100. • Specify the % of respondents who supported each designation, as has been done for LGS 1. • Clarify the forms of use the land may be used for. 		
<p>Page 28 HOU1: Housing Development The Neighbourhood Plan does not provide justification for infill development in Leycett and Onneley, with particular reference to how development in these locations could be considered to be sustainable. The Transport section states the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to promote reduced car journeys by providing and encouraging alternative modes of transport. This is not compatible with infill development in Onneley and Leycett. In the absence of justification of the sustainability of these settlements for development, the Council may object to this policy.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: The Plan should justify how development in Leycett and Onneley is sustainable. If evidence is provided and this policy clause is retained, the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to define infill with greater clarity in the interpretation section and consider the appropriateness of village envelopes to aid decision makers.</p> <p>Policy sentence structure could be improved - Second set of bullet points: remove 'there being'</p>	<p>Comments noted, see amendments in Staffs C.C</p> <p>Action, consider rationale and add further justification.</p> <p>Amend the policy to include more carefully wording to only include infill. The policy caters for limited growth, but will not have any significant impact on traffic generation.</p>	<p>Action, amendments to policy suggested in Staffordshire C.C comments/actions.</p>

<p>As noted in general comments – the scope of some of the issues identified in this section – housing affordability, need for a specific type, bedroom number and tenure of housing is not likely to be fully addressed by Policy HOU1 which limits development to within existing boundaries.</p> <p>As acknowledged in the 'Interpretation' section, site allocation may require consideration in the Local Plan to fully address issues identified in the Housing Needs Survey. The Borough Council wishes to work closely with Madeley Parish Council on any developing proposals.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: No specific change. Continue to work in conjunction with the Borough Council consider how to address the issues identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and whether village envelopes require amendment.</p>		
<p>Page 30 HOU2: Housing Mix</p> <p>Clarify whether number of rooms equates to bedrooms. In assessing property sizes, reference is made either to square meters or bedrooms. Counting all rooms can be vague as utility rooms, kitchen/ diners, annexes etc are counted differently by different people</p> <p>The Interpretation section could go further to specify how this is expected to be delivered.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: state bedrooms rather than room and extra paragraph in the 'interpretation' section.</p>	<p>Comments noted, make amendments to policy to clarify the wording and reflect the comments made.</p>	<p>Action: Update policy to read 'this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller housing suitable for first time buyers and those seeking to downsize; • Family housing for different family sizes; • Housing suitable for older people including sheltered housing and extra care.

		<p>Affordable homes must be provided within the development or the neighbourhood area and should be tenure blind.</p> <p>Add the need for shared ownership and build to rent schemes in the interpretation.</p>
<p>Page 31 Design When referencing design standards, clarity is required to define ‘... well designed...’ or ‘... poor design’ standards (paras 2 and 4). What reference points are being used to define good and bad?</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Provide further reference details possibly alongside the heritage section to identify positive design examples and reference why these are special to Madeley. The identification of certain materials such as the Staffordshire Blue brick in Policy DES1 is welcomed.</p>	<p>Comments noted, the policy sets out what is meant by well-designed places in the bullet points.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>Page 33 DES2: Development in the Madeley Conservation Area Further justification for the identification of these particular views would be beneficial. Were these supported by the community? Are they in line with key views identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal? Are there any key elements of the views that need preserving and are there opportunities for enhancement?</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: A descriptive sentence explaining why these key views are significant would strengthen the policy position and aid justification of the policy approach.</p>	<p>Comments noted, make reference in the plan to how the views have been evidenced.</p>	<p>The arrows on the plan for the views have been updated to ensure they equate to the wording in the policy and the rationale to the policy includes the evidence to support the view identified.</p>

<p>Page 35 Policy CF1</p> <p>In considering replacement facilities, is a simple quantities provision sufficient or will consideration be given to qualitative gains?</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: To provide flexibility in delivering development options. Expand point iii) to explain how an alternative provision is assessed?</p>	<p>Comments noted, re-word the policy to reflect the comments made.</p>	<p>Action, update wording to read 'New development must have no significant adverse impact on the recreation, leisure, play and sports facilities listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rec 1 etc.. <p>Plans for each of the sites are shown in appendix 2.</p> <p>The loss of a community facility will only be allowed where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a sustainable location; or • It can be demonstrated
---	---	---

		the use is no longer viable.
<p>Page 36 CF2: Community Infrastructure The 'Interpretation' section should clarify that there is not currently an adopted CIL, but the policy sets clear priorities should CIL be adopted in future</p>	<p>Comments noted, update policy to reflect comments.</p>	<p>Action, update policy to read 'in considering allocation of infrastructure monies the following priorities should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List the 3 points in the policy here' <p>Remove the last sentence that reads 'in allocating Section 106...'</p>
<p>Page 37 NE1: Natural Environment It is unclear why two policies are required to protect some of the identified Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Preserving and enhancing all woodland and mature hedgerow where not otherwise protected (e.g Tree Preservation Orders or Ancient Woodland) may not be feasible in all development proposals.</p> <p>Furthermore, the policy cannot remove statutory protection to Conservation Area trees because they are considered not to contribute to the street scene.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider what the policy will achieve in addition to LGS: Local Green Spaces Consider biodiversity net gain and/or adding a clause – unless it can be demonstrated... 	<p>Comments noted, update the policy to respond to the comments made.</p>	<p>Action, remove the paragraph prior to policy NE1.</p> <p>Update policy to read 'Development must preserve or enhance the rural character of the area. This includes consideration of impacts on wildlife habitats, ecology and biodiversity. Development should provide biodiversity net gain.</p>

		<p>Features of particular sensitivity include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add bullet point list..
<p>Page 39 TRA1: Critical Road Junctions Secure cycle storage may not be necessary for all development types dependant on the end user or the type of development.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Consider adding 'where appropriate' and consider defining what is meant by secure cycle storage and how this would apply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The supporting text refers to 'non planning issues' in respect of viable bus services however this does not appear in the 'non planning issues' section. • The 'Interpretation' section suggests there is a plan showing critical road junctions. It is unclear where this plan is. <p>Suggested Amendment: Check text</p>	<p>Comments noted, agree with comments. Make amendments to policy to reflect the comments.</p>	<p>Update policy to read 'Development must be supported by a balanced transport provision, proportionate to the scale and nature of development.</p> <p>Development likely to create additional journeys must be supported by secure covered storage for cycles and scooters. This includes provision for all new dwellings.</p> <p>Development must not cause.....'</p>
<p>Page 42 Non Planning Issues It is unclear why this commentary is necessary. It is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to define specific transport solutions unless there is evidence for its requirement, cost, funding and delivery.</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Suggest omitting this section.</p>	<p>Comments noted, make amendments to the non-planning section.</p>	<p>Action, add an explanatory paragraph ahead of the non-planning issue listed to explain:</p> <p>1) make clear not part of the statutory development plan.</p>

<p>Additional Climate change and carbon reduction measures are becoming a more common feature of planning policies. Given these policies can lead towards new forms of development that may differ markedly from established design forms, it may be prudent for the plan to look at what measures may be preferential in the parish or around specific locations. For example, would it be appropriate to support the provision of solar panels on roof pitches not facing the street?</p> <p>Suggested Amendment: Provision of new section at end of plan and importantly, to identify the areas of the parish which could accommodate various forms of development to deliver low or no-carbon energy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The plan encourages innovative design, seeks to reduce car journeys and supports pedestrian movement and cycling.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
---	--	----------------------------

B. Residents' responses

Letters, Emails and Comments from Residents

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Action
<p>Response from resident – General comment that the plan was balanced and carefully drawn up. All policies were agreed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>Response from resident – Agreed with all policies agreed. There were two comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the capacity of sewerage and drainage in the Parish should be considered to ensure it is adequate. • Improvements to pavements between Greyhound and Chemist 	<p>Comment about sewerage and drainage – Severn Trent did not raise any concerns in their response. Policy DES1 Design already encourages new development to include sustainable drainage and permeable surfaces.</p> <p>The Parish Council has already liaised with</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

	Staffordshire County council regarding the pavements in the village and improvement work is scheduled for 2021.	
<p>See detailed response form from a resident. A summary of the points raised are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reference to national planning policy accessibility for all members of the community. • Policies relating to the conservation area • Non-planning matters • Enforcement • Encouraging carbon neutral design • Extension the conservation area • Community assets and facilities • Highways 	<p>We have noted the comments and where applicable made changes to the draft plan.</p> <p>Comments noted about the Conservation Area. No change.</p> <p>The design policy seeks to encourage sustainable and increased environmental performance in developments.</p> <p>The suggestion relating to the extension of the conservation area will be sent to NULBC as they are the responsible body for such amendments.</p> <p>Walking, jogging and horse riding are not mentioned in the plan.</p>	No action required.

	<p>Comments noted in particular about the poor bus service provision and routes. Policy CF2 Community Infrastructure seeks to address this. No amendments required.</p> <p>Comments noted about the issues relating to the proposed development at Madeley Heath.</p>	
--	---	--

Comments from Residents at the Walk-in Events at the Madeley Centre

Comments and Suggested Amendments	Comments	Action
<p>33 residents attended the walk-in sessions at the Madeley Centre. Of the people who attended, 15 made comments. In summary, their comment were as follows:</p> <p>All supported the Neighbourhood Plan and there were no objections.</p> <p>One resident commented that the capacity of sewerage and drainage in the Parish should be considered in the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure it is adequate.</p> <p>Nine residents specifically mentioned the importance and gave their support to the Local Green Policies with strong support for LGS1 Doctors Field and LGS3 College Field.</p> <p>Five residents mentioned the issues of the Monument junction being an important issue for the Neighbourhood Plan to cover.</p>	<p>Comments noted, no modifications.</p> <p>Comment about infrastructure capacity – Severn Trent did not raise any concerns in their response. Policy DES1 Design already encourages new development to include sustainable drainage and permeable surfaces.</p>	<p>No action required</p>