

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

Representation ID	Name / Organisation	Policy / Section commented on.	Do they support or object to the Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan?	Do they wish to be notified of the decision?	Summary of Representations
ENP1	Mr G Varga	Policy 1.	Support	Yes	The two sites north of Stone Road are liable to flooding. Evidence has been supplied to SBC. Site feasibility is required for them to be considered suitable for development.
ENP2	E Ranson	Policy 5.	Object	Yes	Policy 5 on the link road between Stone Road and Stafford Road should be deleted. Objects to the potential 'rat run' which will be created between Stone Road and Stafford Road as part of the development proposals.
ENP3	Network Rail	General.	Support	Yes	The ENP includes railway land within its boundary. Whilst there is no 'in principle' objection, concerned that developments within the red line will not require planning permission. Any proposal within 10m of the operational railway will require review

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					and approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Team.
ENP4	Ms S Bramall	Section 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11-17, General.	Object	Yes	<p>Objects to the consultation process and that it has been focussed upon the town of Eccleshall and not the wider Parish.</p> <p>The ENP fails to consider the rural areas and smaller villages such as Slindon and the future needs of those residents over the Plan period. The Plan does however consider the village of Croxton so it is biased.</p> <p>Traffic and parking is a problem in Slindon and there is no parking at St Chad's Church in Slindon.</p>
ENP5	Mr L Serjeant	Section 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 and Site 3.	Object	Yes	<p>Objects to site 3 (land north of Eccleshall and east of Castle Street). This should be omitted from the ENP.</p> <p>The site is in the flood zone, access would be from castle Street and congestion is already a problem within the village. The site is historically sensitive.</p>

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					Eccleshall already has 212 houses with planning permission and has met its share of housing across the Key Service Villages.
ENP6	Ms A Serjeant	Section 6, 8 and 9.	Object	No	<p>Objects to site 3 (land north of Eccleshall and east of Castle Street). This should be omitted from the ENP.</p> <p>The site is in the flood zone, access would be from castle Street and congestion is already a problem within the town. The site is historically sensitive.</p> <p>There is a need to reduce the volume of traffic in the centre of the village. Proposals to the north of the village will make it worse.</p> <p>The aspiration for the Country park is flawed as frequently floods.</p>
ENP7	Coal Authority	General	Support	Yes	The ENP is outside the defined coalfield and therefore no specific comments.

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

ENP8	Gladman Developments	Section 4, Policy 1.	Object	Yes	The ENP is anti-growth and is not flexible to respond to changes in the market place. The Plan fails to properly consider land off Shaw's Lane for inclusion.
ENP9	Historic England	General.	Support	Yes	Clear reference to archaeological considerations are needed.
ENP10	Natural England	Section 8.	Object	Yes	The ENP fails to make provision for biodiversity and enhancement. There is no reference for the delivery of new biodiversity provision or the need to protect and enhance.
ENP11	Sport England	Section 8.	Support	Yes	It is important that ENP reflects national policy for sport. If new sports facilities are proposed they should be in accordance with SE guidance notes.
ENP12	Mr J Treanor	Section 8.	Support	Yes	The ENP fails to consider other smaller villages such as Slindon. The village is affected by high volumes of traffic. Potential planning application for off-site parking in the village.

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

ENP13	Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Raleigh Hall	Section 7, 8, 11-17	Object	Yes	<p>Raleigh Hall is a Recognised Industrial Estate and the boundary is defined in the emerging Plan for Stafford Borough Part 2.</p> <p>Object to Policy 3 on Jobs and Employment notably that uses that generate significant amounts of traffic which would affect the road infrastructure will not be supported until suitable measures are introduced. The site is allocated in the Plan for Stafford Borough and the ENP cannot conflict with the adopted Plan.</p> <p>Object to policy 4 on traffic and parking. Road infrastructure is not considered to be relevant in the context of the extension at Raleigh Hall.</p>
ENP14	Mrs J Broomfield	Policy 1	Object	No	<p>Object to land north of Stone Road being allocated for development. The site is vulnerable to flooding. The proposed access route on Castle Street will add to congestion in the village.</p>
ENP15	Mr R Clark	Section 3, 8, 11-17	Support	Yes	<p>Reference at paragraphs 3.1 and 3.3 to 'existing infrastructure and services' is ambiguous. Suggests alternative</p>

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					<p>wording to address the ambiguity.</p> <p>The link road proposed under Policy 5 should form part of the by-pass to the east of the village as it would alleviate congestion in the centre. Suggests alternative text.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.2 suggests alternative text in respect of the provision of the bypass to the east of the village.</p>
ENP16	Mr P Taylor	Section 3, 4, 6, 8, General	Object	Yes	<p>Eccleshall is not sustainable a settlement for this reason development should be spread throughout the parish not just in the village.</p> <p>A number of respondents support development in the rural areas. There are brownfield sites in the parish that could be developed as oppose to greenfield sites on the edge of Eccleshall.</p>
ENP17	Gratton Planning on behalf of H & H Holman Properties Ltd	Section 4, 6, 11-17, General	Object	Yes	<p>The proposed settlement boundary to the west of Castle Street and north of the village is too tightly drawn. It will impact upon the number of houses being capable of being delivered owing</p>

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					to infrastructure costs, planning obligation and affordable housing. It also does not reflect the extent of flood risk.
ENP18	Mr M Tweed	Section 2, 3, 8, 9, 11-17	Support	Yes	<p>Failure to include Slindon Village as part of the ENP.</p> <p>There needs to be a weight restriction on the A518 to prevent it from being used as a shortcut to the M6.</p> <p>St Chad's Church needs to have parking to prevent the risk of accidents. The speed limit in the village should be 30mph.</p>
ENP19	Staffordshire County Council	Policy 4, Section 11-17	Support	Yes	<p>Removal of reference to 'All developments' and instead quantify the type and size of development.</p> <p>Add an additional point to Policy 4 is sought which includes support for public car parking.</p> <p>The provision of a by-pass would have to be development led; the footpath along the B5026 needs to consider other 'off highway' options; the Stone</p>

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					Road is not wide enough to accommodate a central reservation. The aspirations therefore need to be re-visited.
ENP20	Mr N Durrant	Section 4, 6	Object	Yes	Developments of 4 houses or more should provide affordable housing at 40%. All properties identified as 'local Need' should be so in perpetuity. All new housing including bungalows built to Lifetime Homes Standards.
ENP21	Planning Prospects	Section 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11-17, General	Object	Yes	<p>The location of the Country Park in the flood plain is appropriate. Question the allocation of land for housing to east of Castle Street owing proximity to sewage works.</p> <p>The ENP proposes to achieve a density of 25 dph. However recent planning permissions granted in the village have a lower density at 13 and 17 dph. If future applications are submitted with similar densities, the ENP should allocate more land for development in order to meet the housing target.</p>

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					<p>The ENP needs to allocate land for Self-build and Custom Housebuilding.</p> <p>Questions the deliverability of the items listed in the aspirations section.</p> <p>Land at Green lane should be included, other sites are being propose which have similar opportunities and constraints.</p>
ENP22	Environment Agency	Policy 1 and 6	Support	Yes	<p>The EA supports the proposed settlement boundary, as it has been drawn to only allocate land for development in Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>Further development may require expansion and upgrading of the current sewage treatment systems.</p> <p>Supports the aspiration for the country park.</p>
ENP23	Baden Hall Enterprises and JT & DC Goucher	General	Object	Yes	<p>The ENP fails to consider the wider parish, it only considers Eccleshall. It has failed to consider brownfield sites across the parish, and instead has allocated greenfield sites adjacent to the settlement.</p>

Eccleshall Neighbourhood Plan (ENP)

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 29 May – 13 July 2015.

					Coldmeece a former MOD site should have been included. It is a significant area of commercial and business use and could accommodate housing.
ENP24	White Young Green on behalf of J Ross Developments	Policy 1 and 2	Object	Yes	<p>The proposed settlement boundary includes land south of Eccleshall at Cross Butts. This should be extended to include all of J Ross Developments' land interest as this meets the criteria of SP7 of the Plan for Stafford Borough.</p> <p>Policy 1 is too restrictive to the supply of housing and is contrary to national policy, it does not allow flexibility for development beyond the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Policy 2 the house types are based upon preferences and is not evidenced based.</p>
ENP25	Savills Smiths Gore on behalf of the Church Commissioners	Section 6.	Object	Yes	The ENP makes no reference to the re-use of rural buildings. A new policy is required to address this omission.