

**Neighbourhood Plan**  
Shenstone | Stonnall | Little Aston



# **Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan, 2015-2029 Consultation Statement**

**September 2015**

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>KEY RESPONSES FROM CONSULTATION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>Appendix A</b>	Examples of publicity material used to promote engagement events
<b>Appendix B</b>	Neighbourhood Plan survey
<b>Appendix C</b>	Public notice and text of letter/email sent to statutory bodies and other interested parties regarding Pre-Submission Consultation
<b>Appendix D</b>	Schedule of comments and responses to Pre-Submission Consultation
<b>Appendix E</b>	Summary of events and activities

# 1 CONSULTATION PROCESS

## Introduction

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (SNP).
- 1.2 The legal basis of this Consultation Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
  - contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
  - explain how they were consulted;
  - summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
  - describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.3 The policies contained in the SNP are as a result of considerable interaction and consultation with the community and businesses within the ward of Shenstone. Work has involved community groups over approximately two years, as well as surveys, public meetings and events. This has been overseen and coordinated by the SNP Group which was formed to lead the SNP. Views and interactions from this process led to the Vision and Objectives in Section 3 of the SNP, and subsequently therefore form the basis for the key policies set out in Sections 4 to 10 of the SNP. Non-land use objectives that have come out of the process of preparing the SNP are included in Section 11.

## Organisational structure of the SNP

- 1.4 The SNP has been prepared after extensive community involvement and engagement. The SNP Group has reflected the views of the community of the need for well-designed development principally to address local needs, along with the provision of community infrastructure.
- 1.5 The structure put in place was a small Steering Group leading on work across the range of themes that formed the basis of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. This Steering Group met jointly with members of the Little Aston Neighbourhood Plan because there was a strong synergy between the two plans which were being prepared at the same time.
- 1.6 This was supported by four working groups addressing the following:
  - Housing and Community
  - Environment and Transport
  - Commerce
- 1.7 In total there were 25 volunteers from the community on the four working groups. Of this number, three were Shenstone Parish councillors. The Steering Group met regularly throughout the process.
- 1.8 The Working Groups met regularly, as did the Joint Steering Group and the minutes of meetings were made available on the Neighbourhood Plan website – [www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk](http://www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk).

### **Public events and consultation activities**

- 1.9 The following surveys and consultation activities were undertaken as shown in Table 1.1. Examples of the various publicity material is shown in Appendix A and a summary of the key points from all the events and activities is shown in Appendix E.

### ***Stakeholder consultations***

- 1.10 Throughout the process, The SNP Group worked closely with Lichfield District Council (LDC). Meetings were held with officers from LDC to address matters pertaining to, in particular housing and green belt matters. There was also an ongoing dialogue to discuss early drafts of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.11 The SNP Group submitted a formal screening request regarding the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the draft SNP in November 2014. LDC provided its formal response later in November 2014, stating that an SEA was required. A copy of the full Screening Report is included as part of the supporting evidence base.
- 1.12 The SEA Scoping Report was prepared and submitted to LDC for formal consultation with the statutory bodies (Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England). The 5-week consultation period ran from 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 to 29<sup>th</sup> April 2015. The comments made were considered and revisions duly made to the Scoping Report.
- 1.13 Other consultees that the Steering Group engaged with included:
- Staffordshire County Council
  - Local landowners
  - Lichfield Rail Promotion Group
  - London Midland Rail

### **Engaging with hard-to-reach groups**

- 1.14 There were no specific groups that were felt to be under-represented throughout the process. Attendance at the engagement events was from a wide cross section of the community that broadly represented the demographic mix of Shenstone. The only area that was felt to have less involvement that expected was from young people. In order to rectify this, engagement was undertaken specifically through Greysbrooke School, the main primary school serving the area.

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

**Table 1.1: List of events and engagement activities**

Event	Date	Purpose of event	Venue	Attendees/ distribution	Flyers to all households	Parish Council Magazine	Parish billboards	Website
Neighbourhood Plan launch	Apr 2013	To inform the community about the NP and to seek volunteers	Village Hall	54	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Community engagement events	Oct 2013	To seek feedback on the early findings of the evidence gathering	Village Hall	48	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Mar 2014	To seek community views on a series of possible options for addressing issues arising through the evidence gathering	Village Hall	51	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sep 2014	To present a first draft of the NP to the community and seek views/clarification of matters	Village Hall	45	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Schools engagement	Dec 2013	Specific event to seek the views of younger people in the community	Greysbrooke School	Year 5 & 6	No	No	No	No
Community survey	Jan 2014	Survey to understand community views on specific matters	Paper survey & Electronic	249	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community Survey - Travel Plan Shenstone & Stonnall	Feb 2014	Survey asking the views of the community on a range of travel issues	Paper survey & Electronic	490	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Call for sites	May 2014	Invitation to landowners to submit land for consideration in the NP	Post	5	No	No	No	No
Traffic & Parking Survey	Jul 2014	Specific survey to look at key issues, specifically parking	Main Street Shenstone	NA	No	No	No	No

**Notes**

Posters	Displayed in Official Notice Boards and local shops as well as distributed to local Groups
Flyers	Distributed to all households
Parish Council Magazine	Distributed quarterly in 2014 to all households with Neighbourhood Plan updates in every edition. Also included in the 3 editions in 2015

## 2 KEY RESPONSES FROM CONSULTATION

- 2.1 The Launch Event identified some of the key issues that the Working Groups then sought to address.
- 2.2 At the October 2013 engagement event, the findings on the key issues and the development of the vision was very firmly endorsed by the community.
- 2.3 By January 2014, the Working Groups had clear evidence on a number of issues. In order to gather further evidence, a survey was sent to every household in the ward. There were nearly 350 responses, representing 13% of those on the electoral role but a 27% response rate when compared to the number of households. The main findings were as follows:
- 80% of respondees said that smaller properties were needed, either for first-time buyers or for older downsizers.
  - 78% identified HGV traffic as a problem in the village, caused by businesses at Birchbrook Industrial Estate.
  - 88% of respondees identified a need for more recreational facilities for teenagers. This was split across a range of different possible facilities.
  - 56% of respondees considered that there was a need for more small offices and flexible workspaces.
  - 53% of respondees said that better broadband access was needed.
- 2.4 The survey is shown in Appendix B, with the results in a separate evidence document.
- 2.5 In order to understand more about the issues relating to traffic and parking, separate travel and parking surveys were undertaken. The travel survey was for the areas of Shenstone and Stonnall whereas the parking survey was focused on the centre of Shenstone. The travel survey reinforced the issues relating to HGV traffic and the parking survey confirmed the extent of the issue, particularly in relation to the amount of on-street parking generated by workers in the businesses in the centre of Shenstone. Both of these survey reports are provided in separate evidence base documents.
- 2.6 At an engagement event in September 2014, the drafted options for policies were presented along with the possible sites put forward for development. The community gave feedback on the policies which was broadly positive, although there were some people who considered that there should be alternative types of provision of leisure facilities at Shenstone Playing Fields for older people. The evidence was reviewed and it was considered that there was a greater demand for the uses proposed.
- 2.7 The feedback on the sites was collated and it was clear that there was a strong preference for redevelopment of the Birchbrook Industrial Estate for a mixed use development, incorporating the opportunity to provide more parking and better access to the station, as well as opening up the Fotherley Brook. There was a strong preference to avoid development of all of the other site options, with many considering that the loss of Green Belt land could not be justified.

### 3 REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

3.1 The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group finalised the Draft SNP in October 2014. The Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation ran for an eight-week period from 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2014 to 4<sup>th</sup> January 2015. Initially this was intended to run for a 6-week period but, following various requests from the community to allow more time, it was extended by two weeks. A coordinated publicity campaign was undertaken which comprised:

- A notice and link to the plan was added to the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan website ([http://www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/?page\\_id=588](http://www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/?page_id=588))
- Notifications were sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees via email (where possible) or hard copy letter if no email address was available (see below).
- A public notice was put up on the noticeboards around the ward. This is shown in Appendix C.

#### Distribution to Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees

3.2 In accordance with requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, relevant statutory consultees were notified by letter. In addition, a range of parties that the Steering Group considered were likely to have an interest in the plan were also written to. All parties were advised to download a copy of the plan, but were advised that hard copies could be issued on request.

3.3 The full list of statutory consultees that were written to is as follows:

Consultee
Lichfield District Council
Environment Agency
English Heritage
Natural England
Marine Management Organisation
Western Power Transmission
National Grid
South Staffordshire Water
Severn Trent Water
NHS Property Services
Network Rail
Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group
South Staffordshire & Seisdon Clinical Commissioning Group
North Staffordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
Staffordshire County Council
Homes and Communities Agency
East Staffordshire Borough Council
South Derbyshire District Council
NW Leicestershire District Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council
Tamworth District Council
Birmingham City Council
Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
Cannock Chase District Council
Highways Agency
Highfield ward councillors
Leomansley ward councillors
St Johns ward councillors
Sutton Four Oaks ward councillors

<b>Consultee</b>
Brownhills ward councillors
Hammerwich ward councillors
Bourne Vale ward councillors
Little Aston ward councillors
Stonnall ward councillors
Wall Parish Council
Weeford Parish Council
Hammerwich Parish Council
Shenstone Golf Club
Aston Wood Golf Club

3.4 A copy of the email sent to the statutory bodies is shown in Appendix C.

***Responses***

3.5 In total there were 9 respondents to the Pre-Submission Consultation. This reflected a mixture of landowners and other stakeholders.

3.6 The schedule of comments and the respective responses made are shown in Appendix D. As a result, the Submission SNP has been appropriately amended.



## **Appendix A      Examples of publicity material used to promote engagement events**



# Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan

Shenstone  
Stonnall  
Little Aston

Wednesday 24th April 2013  
at 7.30pm  
An introductory meeting is  
planned for



## Shenstone Village Hall, Barnes Road, Shenstone

**Localism is here**, giving power to communities to shape the future of the places where they live, work and play. The Government's Localism Act has devolved power to local communities to make local decisions which are of importance to them.

This initiative provides an opportunity for us, as a community, to play a part and put together our own land use plan for the next 15 years. These Neighbourhood Plans have specific objectives, and represent a genuine opportunity to shape the future of our village for ourselves and for the generations to come and to create something we can all be proud of.

It is therefore paramount that we put in place a robust strategy based upon the needs of our community, informed by consultation with the people that count most, **YOU!**

Ultimately this plan will be used to determine all major planning applications in the village so **WE** have to get it right to ensure that these applications are determined in the way **WE** want!

### **What happens if we don't put a Neighbourhood Plan in place?**

The simple answer is nothing - the existing system is maintained whereby decisions on our future are made by Lichfield District Council as opposed to the members of our community. This is an unparalleled opportunity to bring power back to local people and to ensure we preserve and maintain what is important to us and to future generations

**Housing is always a hot topic** - Lichfield District Council has its own strategy whereby they have identified a need for more housing in the village of Shenstone. We can make sure that this is the correct type of housing for our needs and say where it should be located. This of course will have a real knock-on effect on the village's local shops, doctors, dentist, library, highways, Greysbrooke school, local public houses, transport, parking and last (but not least) crime and by this we mean a **POSITIVE** effect. However, the plan will need to carefully balance consideration of impacts on all of these vital services.

**It is therefore imperative that we formulate our own Neighbourhood Plan that considers how we want to develop the village and how we can make Shenstone a better place to live.**

To make it happen we need to form a steering group which takes ownership of the process and puts a plan together that will deliver the **wishes of our community**. There may also be working groups that will focus on particular issues, be it housing, employment, environment, transport, etc.

These working groups should be made up of members of the community – in short, **YOU!**

To that end you are invited to a presentation where we will explain more about the **Neighbourhood Plan** and what it can achieve. It will help you understand what we are looking to do, how we plan to approach engagement with the community and importantly the formation of steering and working groups to drive this initiative forward to enable us to ultimately deliver a plan that reflects what **WE** want to see in **OUR** area in the future. This meeting will also provide you with an opportunity to ask questions and to hopefully get involved in the process to ensure that the plan addresses the issues that are important to **YOU**.

***The presentation and questions session should last for no more than 1 hour  
Please try to attend if you can - this is your opportunity to shape our future!***

**SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

# **SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EVENT**

## **HOW CAN SHENSTONE CONTINUE TO THRIVE AS A COMMUNITY?**

The Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan is underway. It will shape the future of Shenstone and how it does this is in your hands.

Our Working Groups have been considering a range of issues and want to present this to you. We need your feedback – have we got it right and wrong? Have we missed anything?

Also, we want to hear from you about what makes Shenstone the community it is and what it needs to maintain this and make it stronger.

In order to hear from you, we are holding an event that you are all invited to:

Date: **15<sup>th</sup> October 2013**

Time: **7pm – 9pm**

**(‘How can Shenstone continue to thrive as a Community?’ Discussion Forum from 8pm)**

Venue: **Shenstone Village Hall, Barnes Road**

Pop along to give your views and join in with the Discussion Forum if you would like

**IT IS YOUR SHENSTONE SO WE NEED YOUR VIEWS ABOUT ITS FUTURE**

# **SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EVENT**

## **Draft Plan Presentation**

The Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan, has now entered a very important phase of its development. We are now bringing together all of the work carried out through the working groups, engagement sessions, consultation, and guidance via Navigus Planning into a draft plan.

## **You are invited to a presentation to see the first draft of our plan.**

The purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan is to guide development within the ward and provide guidance to any interested parties wishing to submit planning applications for development within the ward. The process of producing a plan has sought to involve the community as widely as possible and the different topic areas are reflective of matters that are of considerable importance to Shenstone, its residents, businesses and community groups. Without a plan, the ward could be subject to a considerable amount of unwanted and potentially inappropriate and unsustainable development.

**Date: 17<sup>th</sup> September 2014**

**Time: 7pm – 9pm**

**Venue: Shenstone Village Hall, Barnes Road**

**(Present back to the community & workshop forum  
from 8pm)**

**IT IS YOUR SHENSTONE SO WE NEED YOUR VIEWS ABOUT  
ITS FUTURE**

## **Appendix B**

## **Neighbourhood Plan survey**

## SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY

About You		Male		Female	
<b>How old are you?</b>		16 – 18	19 – 35	36 – 64	65 +
<b>Working Status</b>	<b>Full Time</b>	Part Time	Student	Unemployed	Retired
<b>What type of residential property is most needed in Shenstone?</b>		Small properties for first-time buyers	Smaller properties for downsizing	Large family properties	Residential Flats
<b>How many houses should be built?</b>		50	100	150	200
<b>Capacity and congestion problems at the Primary School have been identified. Do you think that relocating the school to a bigger site in Shenstone and placing housing on the existing site is a good idea?</b>		Yes		No (please say why)	
<b>HGV traffic has been identified as a problem. Is it such a problem that redeveloping part of the Industrial Estate for housing would be worthwhile? Location West of the train line.</b>		Yes		No (please say why)	
<b>There are also the following options put forward for new residential development which one would be acceptable?</b>		East of Birmingham Road (Green belt)	South & East of Shenstone Court (Green belt)	Adjacent to Court Drive (Green belt)	Mill Brook adjacent to Lammas land (Green Belt)
<b>It has been suggested that proposals for development that include 'garden grabbing' should generally be resisted. Do you agree with this suggestion?</b>		Yes		No (please say why)	
<b>It has been suggested that more recreational facilities for teenagers are needed. What facilities are needed? [You may provide multiple answers]</b>		None	Skate board/BMX	Youth shelter	Other Please specify

<b>What leisure facilities would you use regularly if more were provided in Shenstone? [You may provide multiple answers]</b>	Grass sports pitches	All weather pitches (five-a-side, tennis etc)	Indoor sports facilities	Other
<b>If leisure is important please add your comments</b>	Please specify			
<b>Do problems with parking prevent you using the shops in the village?</b>	Yes		No	
<b>If yes to parking would you welcome parking restrictions?</b>	Comments			
<b>Is there anything that prevents you from using the train from Shenstone more regularly?</b>	Yes (please specify)		No	
<b>What type of employment spaces should there be more of locally?</b>	Small office/ flexible workspaces	Light industrial units	Warehousing units	Other (please specify)
<b>Is access to decent broadband speeds an issue for you?</b>	Yes		No	
<b>What do you feel Shenstone needs in order to maintain a vibrant economic, social &amp; environmental community?</b>	Please specify			
<b>If you could change, add or improve ONE aspect of Shenstone, what would this be?</b>				
<b>If you have any comments or further suggestions, please enter these in the space below</b>				

**Thank You**

## **Appendix C**

### **Public notice and text of letter/email sent to statutory bodies and other interested parties regarding Pre- Submission Consultation**



## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

### **SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION**

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Shenstone Parish Council is undertaking Pre-Submission Consultation on the Shenstone Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).

We are hereby seeking your views on the Draft NDP. The plan can be viewed here: [www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk](http://www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk) under the Shenstone tab. A hard copy is available at The Parish Council office.

The pre-submission consultation commenced on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November and the closing date for representations is the 14<sup>th</sup> December at 23.59.

Representations can either be emailed to Sue Nelson at

[admin@shenstone-staffs.gov.uk](mailto:admin@shenstone-staffs.gov.uk)

or sent by post to:

Shenstone Parish Council, 25C Main Street, SHENSTONE, WS14  
0LZ

Yours sincerely

S. Nelson  
Parish Clerk

ConsultationMailOct14

SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

Dear Consultee

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Shenstone Parish Council is undertaking Pre-Submission Consultation on the Shenstone Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). As a body that we are required to consult, we are hereby seeking your views on the Draft NDP. The plan can be viewed here: [www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk](http://www.parishneighbourhoodplan.co.uk) under the Shenstone tab. A hard copy can be provided on request.

The pre-submission consultation runs for a period of six weeks. The closing date for representations is 14<sup>th</sup> December 2014 at 23.59. Representations can either be emailed to Sue Nelson at

[admin@shenstone-staffs.gov.uk](mailto:admin@shenstone-staffs.gov.uk)

or sent by post to:

Shenstone Parish Council, 25C Main Street, SHENSTONE, WS14 0LZ

Yours sincerely

S. Nelson  
Parish Clerk

## **Appendix D      Schedule of comments and responses to Pre-Submission Consultation**

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

**SHENSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
1	Lichfield District Council	General	One main comment relates to the Proposals Map within the plan (see section specific comments below for more detail) which suggests that a number of 'Potential Housing Sites' are being allocated whereas the plan only seeks to allocate one of these sites. A clearer proposals map which shows only the sites being allocated should be included within the plan, this should include other allocations being made such as the Local Green Spaces. Lichfield District Council can assist with some mapping if required.	Agreed.	Proposals map to be revised.
2	Lichfield District Council	General	The designated Neighbourhood Area is not contiguous with the boundary of Shenstone Ward. Shenstone Ward extends beyond Shenstone Parish boundary and as you are aware the Neighbourhood Area relates to land within Shenstone Parish. For clarity all references to Shenstone Ward within the plan should be changed to Shenstone Neighbourhood Area to reflect that the plan's policies are relevant to the designated neighbourhood area only. The section specific comments below outline where changes are required with the plan to refer to the Neighbourhood Area rather than the Ward.	Noted	Changes will be made throughout the document
3	Lichfield District Council	Housing	The District Council considers that the figure should be presented as 'a minimum of 50-150' throughout the neighbourhood plan. The Local Plan Strategy provides the village of Shenstone with a range of 50-150 homes within the Plan period. The inspector confirms within his Initial Findings (paragraph 138) that this is considered to be a minimum. The use of the word minimum will ensure that the plan is positive and does not appear to seek to artificially constrain development. This would ensure consistency with the Local Plan and National Planning Policy which seeks to be positive about development.	Noted	Changes will be made throughout the document
4	Lichfield District Council	SEA/HRA	You will be aware that an SEA & HRA screening assessment has been undertaken of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The screening report concludes that in its current form SEA will be required but that the further stages of HRA will not be required. The screening report has been provided to the Parish Council and includes a full appendix of responses from the Statutory Consultees.	Noted	No change
5	Lichfield District Council	Section 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 1.1 – Change 'Shenstone ward' to 'Shenstone Neighbourhood Area'.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 1.1 – Final sentence refers to Little Aston Neighbourhood Plan, change this to 'Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan'.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 1.2 – The whole of Shenstone Ward is not the Neighbourhood Area, the part of Shenstone Ward within Shenstone Parish is</li> </ul>	Noted	Changes made as suggested

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>the designated Neighbourhood Area. Change the first sentence to read 'Lichfield District Council, as the local planning authority, designated the Shenstone Neighbourhood Area in February 2013 to enable Shenstone Parish Council to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 1.3 Final Sentence - Change 'ward' to 'Neighbourhood Area'.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 1.4 – delete 'which is contiguous with the boundary of Shenstone Ward' to reflect changes required as detailed above.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 1.5 – Delete 'within the ward' from the first sentence.</li> </ul>		
6	Lichfield District Council	Section 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Generally supportive of this section which provides a detailed context for the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 2.40 - Final sentence refers to Little Aston Neighbourhood Plan, change this to 'Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan'.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 2.42 – Summaries of the Local Plan Strategy Policies are not taken from the Local Plan Strategy (EiP Changes) document which includes the proposed modifications to the Plan. The EiP changes version of the plan can be viewed via <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/mods">www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/mods</a> . Where the Neighbourhood Plan makes reference to the Local Plan it should refer to the latest version of the plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Summary of Policy Shen1 includes text which is proposed to be deleted and does not include proposed amended text.</li> <li>o Summary of Policy Shen3's footnote 3 states that LDC planning officers confirmed this can be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Plan Strategy states that the role of Birchbrook Industrial Estate will be fully considered through the Local Plan Allocations document. The Neighbourhood Plan must show how this role has been considered. The footnote is not required and should be deleted.</li> <li>o Summary of Policy Shen4 footnote 4 states that LDC planning officers confirmed this can be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Allocations are proposed through the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan. The District Council considers that where reference is made to the housing range of 50-150 for Shenstone this should be presented as 'a minimum of 50-150'. The footnote is not required and should be deleted.</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 2.43 - Change 'ward' to 'Neighbourhood Area'.</li> </ul>	Noted	Changes made as suggested
7	Lichfield District Council	Section 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 3.1 - Change 'ward' to 'Neighbourhood Area'.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Vision final paragraph – this refers to 'a relatively small increase in housing'. The Local Plan Strategy provides Shenstone with a range of 50-150 dwellings which should be referred to as a minimum (see comments above). As such the vision should be reworded to reflect this.</li> </ul>	Noted	Vision – the words "relatively small" have been taken out of the final paragraph.

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 3.6 – Change first sentence to ‘Provide for a minimum of 50 to 150 new dwellings over the period 2008-2029 in accordance with...’. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 4.2 - Change ‘ward’ to ‘Neighbourhood Area’.		All other changes made as suggested
8	Lichfield District Council	Section 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 4.2 - Change ‘ward’ to ‘Neighbourhood Area’.	Noted	Changes made as suggested
9	Lichfield District Council	Section 5	<input type="checkbox"/> The inclusion of Policy SAC1: Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation is welcomed. This ensures that development will have regard to the Cannock Chase SAC.	Noted	No change
10	Lichfield District Council	Section 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.2 - Change ‘ward’ to ‘Neighbourhood Area’.  <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.2 first bullet –The range of 50-150 dwellings should be referred to as a minimum. Amend the start of the plan period start date is 2008 as this is the state date of the Local Plan Strategy and as such the range of housing numbers relates to the period 2008-2029.  <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.2 fourth bullet – This should refer to very special circumstances rather than exceptional circumstances. Exceptional Circumstances is the test which relates to consideration of Green Belt boundaries which can only be undertaken through the Local Authorities Local Plan. Very Special circumstances is the test applied to planning applications within the Green Belt to potentially justify inappropriate development.  <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.4 – Add ‘Policy H1’ to the start of the first sentence.	Noted	Changes made as suggested
11	Lichfield District Council	Section 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.7 and Policy H1 – Greater justification/evidence required for this policy. Whilst the dwellings mix broadly conforms to that pursued in the Local Plan Strategy there is little explanation of why it differs or as to why a threshold of 15 units is deemed appropriate. An appropriate dwelling mix may be viable on sites below the threshold proposed. Policy could be reworded to state that appropriate dwelling mix will be sought on each site dependant on scheme viability.	Agree that there is insufficient justification for the 15-unit threshold and that this should be removed. Agree that policy should require the mix on all sites, dependent on scheme viability. Will expand on community engagement which identified in particular the need for more smaller units.	Additional supporting text added and changes made to Policy H1 as suggested.
12	Lichfield District Council	Section 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.9 – delete ‘planning for enclaves of older or younger people’ from the end of the final sentence.	Noted	Changes made as suggested

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs 6.9 to 6.10 – reference should be made within these paragraphs for the need to provide homes to rent as well as buy. Policy H2 of the Local Plan Strategy recognises the need to provide a range of tenures of housing not just home ownership. These paragraphs could include reference to policy H2 of the Local Plan Strategy to acknowledge the importance of providing a range of tenures including properties for rent. Specifically the second sentence of paragraph 6.9 could state that there is a need to provide for those who are unable to purchase and need to rent a home as well as first time buyers.</p>		
13	Lichfield District Council	Section 6	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 6.16 Final sentence &amp; Paragraph 6.17 - Developments which have been permitted will have met the necessary standards in relation to residential amenity as required by the Council. As such it is not correct to state that this have had issues in terms of amenity. Also feel it is inappropriate to name specific developments at paragraph 6.17. Again all developments have received planning permission having being assessed against the policies of the District Council.</p>	<p>Noted and the necessary changes will be made. However, the reference to there being issues concerning amenity have come from the local residents themselves. Whilst the policy has tests regarding amenity, it is considered important to learn from the experience of these living day-to-day with the impacts of developments, not just from theory.</p>	Changes made as suggested
14	Lichfield District Council	Section 6	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Policy H5 – This policy may to too prescriptive. The forthcoming Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document will contain guidance on garden/amenity space required with dwellings. The Policy should be reworded to state that developments which provide adequate amenity space will be supported. The policy could also link to the forthcoming SPD which will contain detailed information on the requirements developments will need to meet. As currently drafted there is little justification for this policy and it's requirement to be so prescriptive about garden/amenity space size per residence.</p>	Agreed.	Changes made to supporting text and Policy H5
15	Lichfield District Council	Section 7	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 7.10 - The range of 50-150 dwellings should be referred to as a minimum.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Policy HA1 – This policy places a large number of requirements on one development. It may be that some of the requirements have an impact on any proposed schemes viability. The policy could be more flexible by stating that provision of those requirements in the policy's criteria will be supported and that subject to viability these may be delivered.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the policy has a significant list of requirements. It should be noted that the policy has been strongly supported by the landowners, with no suggestion of the need to</p>	Changes made to Policy HA1 and supporting text.

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
				reduce the overall requirements. It is proposed that the list of items are separated out into 'required' items and 'items that will be strongly supported, subject to viability'. Have also amended the requirement for B1 floorspace in Policy HA1 to require a minimum of 1,000m2, with this only required once 75% of the units have been completed.	
16	Lichfield District Council	Section 8	<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 8.2 – Supportive of this paragraph as it recognises important issues for the community which may be beyond the scope of a neighbourhood plan. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy MO5 – Unsure if this policy is required, any proposed developments impacts on the road network are considered through the planning process. As such the inclusion of this policy is not required. It is recommended to remove this policy. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy MO5 & MO4 – The numbering of these policies is the wrong way around.	Policy MO5 seeks to address a priority for the community. However, it is acknowledged that this is dealt with by the existing planning process. It is proposed that the supporting text remains and reiterates the importance of this to the community, but Policy MO5 is deleted.	Changes made and Policy MO5 deleted.
17	Lichfield District Council	Section 9	<input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 9.1 first sentence – Replace 'research' with 'evidence' and change 'ward' to 'Neighbourhood Area'.  <input type="checkbox"/> Policy GSC1 – The policy is seeking to allocate three Local Green Spaces, as such these green spaces should be shown on the proposals map within the Plan. The policy or explanatory text should be amended to indicate that the proposed allocations are shown on the proposals map.	Noted	Changes made as suggested
18	Lichfield District Council	Proposals Map	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposals maps shows 5 potential housing sites, yet the text of the plan indicates the allocation of only once of these sites. To be clear the proposals map must show only the site(s) being allocated by the Neighbourhood Plan.  <input type="checkbox"/> The Local Green Spaces being proposed should be shown on the Proposals Map.	Noted	Changes made as suggested



Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
19	Staffordshire County Council	Housing	With regards to Policy H2 we support the requirement for the provision of at least 50% of dwelling to be of a Lifetime Homes standard. The ability for homes to provide flexible accommodation that can adapt as the residents' needs change over time are an important factor in the provision of care and independent living.	Noted	No change
20	Staffordshire County Council	Housing	Policy H5 refers to the provision of private amenity space, which is necessary. However, it is felt that the policy is too rigid and should also allow for the provision of communal space such as community gardens. Communal spaces can assist in encouraging social interaction, which can contribute to a sense of well-being and help tackle issues of loneliness, especially amongst the elderly.	Noted. Changes have been made to Policy H5 as suggested by LDC.	Amendments to Policy H5 as detailed in Ref. No. 14
21	Staffordshire County Council	Section 7	For the Birchbrook Industrial estate site it is considered unlikely that the traffic generated by development accessing Lynn Lane could necessitate the construction of a roundabout as set out in paragraph 7.15. Therefore, the text 'for example a roundabout' needs to be removed. The paragraph preceding that clearly sets out the process the applicant must follow to determine the form of access and therefore there is no need to cite an example that could cause confusion.	Noted	Changes made as suggested
22	Staffordshire County Council	Section 8	We support Policies MO1 and MO2 which seek to improve pedestrian access and parking to Shenstone Railway Station.	Noted	No change
23	Staffordshire County Council	Section 8	Policy M05 suggests new development must demonstrate that additional HGV traffic should not have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing local road network. However, the "possible action" listed in Table 10.1 suggests a strategy for "reducing" the volume of HGVs passing through Shenstone village; which appears to be at odds with previous references to commercial traffic and is unlikely to be successful.	Noted. Policy MO5 is to be deleted.	Delete Policy MO5
24	Staffordshire County Council	Section 8	At paragraphs 7.16 & 8:12 and Policies HA1 & M03 the plan makes reference to improving pedestrian and cycle accessibility, in particular across Lynn Lane Bridge. The plan should acknowledge that the site constraints at Lynn Lane Bridge may preclude the installation of a "safety barrier" to protect pedestrians; and the provision of additional road space for pedestrians and cyclists would require significant investment to widen the existing structure.	Noted	Changes made as suggested to the supporting text
25	Staffordshire County Council	Section 9	There is a lack within the plan of consideration of protection or enhancement of biodiversity, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) . NPPF s.109 states: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:..... minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the	Whilst this is noted in respect of considering matters relating to the scoping of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), these were not matters	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;" s.117 states: "To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation;</li> <li>• promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan;</li> <li>• aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests;</li> </ul> <p>Not only is there no policy reference to protection of designated sites, habitats and species, a proposed residential site is partially within a Biodiversity Alert Site and would result in fragmentation of a local ecological network.</p> <p>The draft plan appears to focus almost only on the village of Shenstone; the wider Neighbourhood area shown on the Plan map is not referred to. This includes a Site of Biological Importance and a rural landscape that would benefit from measures to improve ecological connectivity such as woodland planting, hedgerow planting, restoration and management and heathland creation (cf. Landscape comment below). These would increase environmental value and provide increased opportunities for local people to experience contact with wildlife close to home. Some of these measures could be secured through the development management system, given policy support.</p>	<p>raised by the community so it would be inappropriate to include policies without evidence that they have come from the community engagement.</p>	
26	Staffordshire County Council	Historic environment	<p>The historic environment is not currently well represented within the Neighbourhood Plan for Shenstone, although it does recognise that the village has a rich built heritage (in sections 6.30 and 10.4) and paragraph 2.42 highlights Lichfield District's Local Plan Policy for Shenstone's Conservation Area. However, a number of national and locally designated historic buildings lie within the village but beyond the Conservation Area as well as within the</p>	<p>Whilst this is noted in respect of considering matters relating to the scoping of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), these were not matters raised by the community so it</p>	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>wider Ward, however, these are not highlighted within the Neighbourhood Plan. Above and below ground archaeological remains are also not considered within the Neighbourhood Plan (see Section 2 Local Context and Heritage Assets below).</p> <p>Shenstone's rich historic environment and its contribution to the Ward's sense of place and local character could be highlighted through the inclusion of a number of specific historic environment policies. A number of resources exist which could be consulted in order to strengthen the historic environment aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan and which could support the inclusion of specific policies. These comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) an overview of what is included in this database can be found at <a href="http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/historic-environment-record">www.staffordshire.gov.uk/historic-environment-record</a></li> <li>• The Historic Environment Landscape Character Assessment for Lichfield District which includes an over view of the archaeology, built heritage and historic landscape character of much of the Ward. This can be downloaded from <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/info/856/local_plan/1014/evidence_base/10">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/info/856/local_plan/1014/evidence_base/10</a> (under Assessment for Little Aston)</li> <li>• Totty, R (ed.). 2009. 'A landscape survey of the parish of Shenstone'. The Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society</li> </ul>	<p>would be inappropriate to include policies without evidence that they have come from the community engagement.</p>	
27	Staffordshire County Council	Historic environment	<p>Section 2 Local Context</p> <p>A review of the three resources identified above reveals that there is substantial evidence for prehistoric and Roman activity within the Ward, which could be incorporated into the History of Shenstone section of the Neighbourhood Plan. As well as the contribution of the prehistoric and Roman evidence to our understanding of the development of the Ward these resources also highlight its early medieval and medieval origins. For example it is likely that the historic street pattern (Pinfold Hill and Main Street) along which the oldest known buildings still congregate are likely to have originated in at least these periods. Consequently this historic pattern has influenced the local character and subsequent development of the settlement. Whilst it is recognised that modern farming practices have impacted upon the legibility of the historic rural character there are areas where it is still evident and where its influence can still be discerned within the modern landscape. This includes for example the remnants of historic parkland within the Ward. A large deer park, lying in the south eastern portion of the Ward, was established in the</p>	<p>Whilst this is noted in respect of considering matters relating to the scoping of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), these were not matters raised by the community so it would be inappropriate to include policies without evidence that they have come from the community engagement.</p>	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>mid-13th century and survived until the 17th century. However, its boundary can still be traced in the surviving field boundaries and lanes and it is associated with the Scheduled moated site, which survives as an earthwork. The landscape park associated with The Moss has also influenced the local landscape and, despite housing development in its northern portion and the loss of the country house, the parkland character largely survives. This is apparent in the number of parkland trees, shelter belts and carriageways around the site of the house as well as a number of surviving historic structures associated with the estate including the home farm complex and the walled garden. Further detail on the historic landscape of the Ward can be found on the Lichfield District web page noted above.</p> <p>Farms around the Ward The Staffordshire Historic Farmsteads Survey (2009) project identified 24 historic farmsteads within the Ward which existed by at least 1880 and which retain a degree of their historic plan form (see Historic Landscape Character below). Like the surviving historic field boundaries mentioned in section 9.18 (policy justification) the historic farmsteads contribute to the local rural landscape character of the Ward (see Historic Landscape Character below).</p> <p>Heritage Assets</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies that the Shenstone Conservation Area forms part of the Environment Policy in the emerging Lichfield District Local Plan. No reference is made to any other designated heritage assets of which there are a number within the Ward. These designated heritage assets comprise 25 Nationally Listed Buildings (2 at Grade II* and 23 at Grade II), 24 Locally Listed Buildings (administered by Lichfield District Council), 1 Scheduled Monument and 1 Conservation Area. It is advised that a policy be devised which aims to protect and enhance the national and local designated heritage assets within the Ward, which contribute to both the built character of the village, but also the wider historic rural character of the Ward.</p> <p>Other historic environment policies which should be considered for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan include a policy to take account of the</p>		

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>significant potential for the survival of above and below ground archaeology across the Ward as identified above, but also within the historic core of the village itself.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Character</p> <p>The historic landscape character, whilst impacted by more recent farming practices, comprises the remnant historic character of earlier field patterns (including for example individual historic hedgerows). Should the need for a policy on protecting and enhancing the local landscape character be identified the historic landscape character could be identified as forming a part of it (see Landscape comment below). An understanding of the development and appreciation of the historic character of the landscape is enhanced by the surviving traditional farmsteads. The Staffordshire Historic Farmsteads Survey (2009) is a desk-based project undertaken on behalf of Staffordshire County Council, and funded by English Heritage, as part of a wider project to identify historic farmsteads across the West Midlands and the whole of England. The project aimed to provide a consistent understanding of farmstead character and survival at a landscape scale across Staffordshire. The resulting 'Staffordshire Traditional Farmsteads Guidance' document produced by English Heritage and Staffordshire County Council, due to be finalised shortly, provides advice on identifying the historic character of traditional farmsteads and provides guidance on the first principles for sensitive conversion. This document can be downloaded from <a href="http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/historic-farmsteads">http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/historic-farmsteads</a> . Across Lichfield District 68% of the farmsteads were recorded as having high significance (county average of 59%) having retained more than 50% or more of their historic form and a further 11% have some heritage potential (county average 9.5%) having retained less than 50% of their historic form. Despite this only 14% of traditional farmsteads identified across Staffordshire are associated with a designated heritage asset; this is usually represented by a listed farmhouse. Within Shenstone Ward 77% of the identified historic farmsteads are recorded as having high significance and of these only three are associated with listed buildings. Should a policy relating to traditional farmsteads be identified it is advised that reference should be made to the above guidance.</p>		

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Examples of Neighbourhood Plans which contain strong historic environment policies include the adopted Chaddesley Corbett Neighbourhood Plan <a href="http://www.chaddesleyplan.org.uk/">http://www.chaddesleyplan.org.uk/</a> and the Stonnall Ward Neighbourhood Plan (currently out for consultation) <a href="http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/6151/neighbourhood_plan_document">http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/downloads/file/6151/neighbourhood_plan_document</a></p>		
28	Staffordshire County Council	Section 9	<p>POLICY GSC3: 'MINIMISING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT' helps to address landscape issues regarding impact upon the environment. However, according to the Staffordshire Landscape Assessment (2001) the majority of the ward falls within the landscape character type 'Sandstone Estatelands in Cannock Chase and Cankwood'; with the resulting landscape policy objective as landscape enhancement. This area has also suffered erosion of strength of character and loss of condition of landscape elements, which has resulted in a landscape of medium quality. Permitted developments should be sustainably designed to a high quality with a requirement for environmental and biodiversity enhancement to maintain and improve the quality of the landscape.</p>	Noted and agreed	Changes made to supporting text and to Policy GSC3.
29	Staffordshire County Council	Section 10	<p>We support the general intentions in Policy CO4 to improve Broadband Infrastructure. However, the policy and paragraph 10.13 need to be changed as BT is not the only provider of broadband infrastructure and the Plan may therefore be breaching other legislation. We also feel that in instances where developers cannot provide immediate access as set out in the Policy then the Policy should require that developers ensure that the underground ducting etc. is in place to facilitate future provision without the need to excavate footways or private drives. The following changes are suggested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In paragraph 10.13 where it states '...developers have not contacted BT' this should be changed to ...developers have not contacted Next Generation Access (NGA) Network providers.</li> <li>2. Policy CO4 should be changed as follows with text to be deleted struck through and new text in red – 'On sites allocated for residential development in the Plan all new properties should be served by a superfast broadband (fibre optic) connection <del>installed on an open access basis</del>. Elsewhere in the Plan area all other new buildings should be served with this</li> </ol>	Agree with this recommendation	The changes suggested will be made to Policy CO4.

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			standard of connection when available unless it can be demonstrated through consultation with <del>British Telecom</del> <u>NGA Network providers</u> that this would not be either possible, practical or economically viable. <u>In such circumstances sufficient and suitable ducting should be provided within the site and to the property to facilitate ease of installation at a future date.</u>		
30	Staffordshire County Council	Section 11	In Table 10.1 a number of the issues raised in relation to transport including elements of the environmental enhancements of the village centre are being considered through the local County Councillor's Divisional Highway Programme including parking provision and traffic management plans. Traffic surveys have been undertaken and the data has been provided to Parish Councils for them to establish their priorities and feedback to County Councillor Smith.	Noted	No change
31	Staffordshire County Council	Section 11	Lichfield District Council are preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule and once adopted, with a Neighbourhood Plan in Place the Parish Council will begin to receive a proportion of the CIL receipts from development within the Parish. The Plan should recognise that this new source of funding could be channelled towards infrastructure projects within the Parish, some of which may be listed in table 10.1 as well as considering historically traditional sources of funding.	Agreed	Extra text added into Section 11
32	Environment Agency	Flooding	<p>The Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan makes no mention of flood risk despite a band of Flood Zone 3 being shown adjacent to the Footerley &amp; Bourne Brooks, especially in the area of the Industrial Estates to the West of Shenstone.</p> <p>Development proposals should maintain/restore the natural floodplain and watercourses. This would apply to the Birchbrook Industrial Estate which has a large area of FZ3 within the local plan but the Neighbourhood Plan is encouraging a mixed use redevelopment.</p> <p>The proposals in Section 7 should consider the Footerley Brook and the restoration of the flood plain. Any redevelopment in this area would require a full demonstration of the Sequential Test being passed in line with National Planning Policy Framework especially in light of the amount of other land in FZ1 available. Policy HA1 and to some degree Policy GSC3 should reflect this.</p>	These points are noted and have been assessed through the SEA.	Text added to Section on Birchbrook Industrial Estate and revisions made to Policy HA1. Specifically this relates to the reduction in the overall quantum of housing in the policy and more explicit reference to development unsuitable in a flood zone being located

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>We welcome the document recognition and enhancement of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation in Policy SAC1.</p>		<p>away from that area of the site.</p>
33	Environment Agency	Contaminated land	<p>The following comments relate solely to the protection of 'Controlled Waters' receptors.</p> <p>In planning any development in this area reference should be made to our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' (GP3) document. This sets out our position on a wide range of activities and developments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storage of pollutants and hazardous substances</li> <li>• Solid waste management</li> <li>• Discharge of liquid effluents into the ground (including site drainage)</li> <li>• Management of groundwater resources</li> <li>• Land contamination</li> <li>• Ground source heat pumps</li> <li>• Cemetery developments</li> </ul> <p>The area is located within Source Protection Zone 3 with smaller areas around Shenstone and Little Hay within Source Protection Zones 1 and 2. Source Protection Zones are designated around groundwater abstractions used for drinking water purposes to protect the quality of the water. Within Source Protection Zones certain activities may be restricted, for example underground storage of hazardous substances (e.g. petrol or diesel) in Zone 1. Such restrictions may be applicable to the development at Birchbrook Industrial Estate, Lynn Lane discussed in the plan.</p> <p>Government Policy, as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 120), states that 'where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner'. Consequently should a development site currently or formerly have been subject to land-use(s) which have the potential to have caused contamination of the underlying soils and groundwater then any Planning Application must be supported by a Preliminary Risk</p>	Noted	No change



Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>Assessment. This should demonstrate that the risks posed to 'Controlled Waters' by any contamination are understood by the applicant and can be safely managed. This requirement may be applicable to the development at Birchbrook Industrial Estate, Lynn Lane discussed in the plan.</p> <p>We recommend that the risk management framework provided in the document 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination' (CLR11) is followed, when dealing with land affected by contamination.</p>		
34	Fisher German on behalf of Messrs F Saxton and Son of Ashcroft Farm, Ashcroft Lane, Shenstone	General	<p>The Saxton family has farmed in the Shenstone Ward for over four generations, producing quality produce for sale through Birmingham Wholesale Market. In addition to farming land around the edge of the village, the main farming base is at Ashcroft Farm and two of partners and several employees live in the ward.</p> <p>The partners own land immediately to the south of Birchbrook Industrial Estate and have considered the draft Neighbourhood Plan, particularly section 7 which seeks to allocate part of the Estate for residential development on 2.4 hectares of land, including an area of our client's property to the south.</p> <p>It is noted the development would provide approximately 100 dwellings comprising a range of dwelling types, together with mixed use Class B1 office/light industrial floor space and provision for overflow parking for users of Shenstone Railway Station. The development will be well landscaped and provide publically accessible green space, which can be accommodated within policy upon the Green Belt.</p> <p>Of the five potential alternative sites for housing, The Birchbrook Industrial Estate site is, in our opinion, the only site which meets all the stated policies, visions and objectives of the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan. Comprising mainly previously-developed land in close proximity to the railway line, it affords the opportunity to provide a much-needed mixed range of development for the village with the minimum of encroachment upon open land and with the public benefit of providing facilities for the increased use of public transport based on Shenstone Railway Station.</p> <p>Our clients support the inclusion of their land as part of the proposal and are willing to cooperate with the owners of the industrial estate to jointly bring forward the site to achieve the stated ambitions of the Plan.</p>	Noted	No change
35	Graham Birt - resident	Housing	<p>The Plan rightly recognises that more emphasis is needed on mixed sizes of housing, rather than the present pattern which leaves the market to decide. In my view more developments like Trinity Close would provide 1/2 bedroom housing for both young 'singles' (meaning young people could stay in the village when they leave home) and 'downsizers', without the need for a '15 unit threshold' as suggested in 6.7. Using the Trinity Close example, I do not</p>	Noted	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			believe that 2/3 bedroom developments necessarily need to be grouped together.		
36	Graham Birt - resident	Community Facilities	<p>In general terms, I believe that Shenstone provides fairly well for the young and the elderly (by way of facilities and support groups) but that the demographic majority, ie the middle aged to 'young elderly' are not so well catered for and seem to be largely ignored in this part of the Plan.</p> <p>With specific regard to the Playing Fields:</p> <p>1. The Plan states (9.2) that Shenstone is "deficient in amenity green space for informal play and sport" yet the Playing Fields are dominated by formal space, mainly football, and to a small degree, tennis. Football by definition takes over the majority of space at weekends, when families are at home and could otherwise use the green space for informal play. There is an inference that a second pitch might be required. This cannot be justified at the Playing Fields, but perhaps elsewhere if land can be found, and the Plan should make this clear. Perhaps a new site for both pitches might be the answer, which would then impact on redevelopment of the Pavillion.</p> <p>2. The Plan states (9.15) that 'significant number of residents' favour a rebuilding/redevelopment of the Playing Pavillion'. I would seriously doubt that this is true and would like the statement to be justified by statistical evidence (hard numbers, not just percentages) or removed.</p> <p>If significant money from developers is to be spent on redeveloping the Sports Pavilion, at the expense of other village projects, then the Plan must demonstrate that this is for the benefit of Village residents. As the prime (only?) users of the proposed new changing rooms are footballers, then we have to consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% of all users will by definition not be local (ie the opposition team)</li> <li>• Many (do we know how many?) of Shenstone/Pathfinder team members are also probably not from the Village.</li> </ul> <p>3. I see no justification for floodlighting the tennis courts, based on present levels of membership, potential light pollution and the fact that it is a member-only club, not a general amenity to villagers</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has sought to engage with all demographic groups across the community and reflect the needs and opportunities as best it can.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The needs for formal recreation and informal recreation are separate and distinct needs. However, the community did not identify the need for a new sports pitch so one has not been provided for.</li> <li>2. The evidence base used includes the findings from the community survey, which, in our view, shows a significant number of residents support this provision. There are no hard-and-fast rules as to what percentage means that a plan should provide for this; it is a judgement and we consider that there is sufficient demand for such provision to justify its inclusion. If developer contributions come forward in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy</li> </ol>	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>4. I understand that a bowling green was suggested at the consultation but seems to have been ignored in the Plan. Such a facility would serve the middle aged community. Interestingly, it would perhaps provide some additional justification for upgrading the Sports Pavilion.</p> <p>5. There is no mention at all in the Plan of the integration of the Village Hall. The Hall is the major communal meeting space for the Village and sits on the edge of the Playing Fields. Why is there no indication of how it can be better integrated? For example, if there are to be new changing facilities, why not build on to the Hall and do away with the need for the Pavilion altogether? Also the area behind the Hall should be landscaped and separated from the practice pitch so that Hall users can step out in to a pleasant environment, not a muddy pitch. This would improve the Hall experience for users and hopefully increase usage.</p>	<p>payments and the community makes clear, at that time, that they would be better spent on other infrastructure items, then they rightly should be spent on such items. It should be noted that Policy GSC2 seeks the rebuilding of the Shenstone Sports and Social Club as a “community building” incorporating a range of other provision apart from the needs of those using the sports pitches. This includes a coffee shop and hall space for wider community activities.</p> <p>3. Policy GSC2 provides “support” for such improvements, it does not suggest that developer contributions should necessarily be spent on these improvements. Their inclusion was based on information gathered through the engagement process on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>4. A bowling green was suggested as part of the consultation but as only supported by a small number of people. It was considered that this was</p>	

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
				<p>not significant enough to be included in the draft plan.</p> <p>5. This was not a matter raised by the community through the engagement processes which were used to inform the preparation of the plan.</p>	
37	Keith Jones - resident	Section 9	<p>Having read the plan I have major concerns about just one section - Section 9.</p> <p>The conclusions at 9.15 that :-</p> <p>"the community was specifically asked about community recreation facilities that were required. The following areas were identified by significant numbers of residents:</p> <p>The need for the Sports and Social Club to be rebuilt and to include changing rooms, toilets and a coffee shop along with the potential for youth groups to use the building."</p> <p>seems very much at odds with the age demographic of the village where over 55% of residents are over 45, and more that 25% are over 65. Equally I'm at a loss why a "significant number of residents" would want village funding spent on providing changing room facilities for the local football team, of whom none are village residents or even parish residents. Shenstone is well served with community buildings, all of which do not need re-building.</p> <p>I also note that where all of the other "policies" in the document are generalised - as indeed policies should be, but Policy GSC2 is simply someone's "wish list" of facilities for young people. It is not a policy and does not reflect the wishes of the majority of residents, and should therefore be removed from the plan.</p>	<p>The evidence base used includes the findings from the community survey, which, in our view, shows a significant number of residents support this provision. There are no hard-and-fast rules as to what percentage means that a plan should provide for this; it is a judgement and we consider that there is sufficient demand for such provision to justify its inclusion.</p> <p>It should be noted that Policy GSC2 seeks the rebuilding of the Shenstone Sports and Social Club as a "community building" incorporating a range of other provision apart from the needs of those using the sports pitches. This includes a coffee shop and hall space for wider community activities. This will cater for the needs of a wide age range within Shenstone.</p>	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			I think the rest of the plan is a reasonable reflection of the views of the residents in general terms.		
38	Harris Lamb on behalf of Davy Developments Ltd (Land off Court Drive)	Various	See separate representations document	The selection of the site allocation has been undertaken based on sustainability principles that are detailed in the SEA accompanying the Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered that the proposed allocation of land at Birchbrook Industrial Estate will not have significant environmental effects, therefore it complies with the Basic Conditions. Conversely, the land off Court Drive is not considered to be capable of justification for its release from the Green Belt.	No change
39	Natural England	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted	No change
40	Peter Gravestock - resident	Section 9	<p>I have been involved in the groups as a member of the Transport and environment group, and have read the current draft which appears to me to broadly represent the views of the village.</p> <p>My concern, that I would like to bring to this consultation, is with Policy GSC2. In my opinion this is too prescriptive, and may not be fit for purpose in 15 years' time. If the Parish Council were able to undertake the projects outlined in this policy in the next few years then there would not be a policy for the remainder of the period.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the policy words should be much wider and there by allow the Parish Council more leeway in years to come. I would commend to the consultation the wording suggested by the Transport group as the policy GSC2</p>	The purpose of identifying specific projects is to provide greater certainty that they will be provided. The suggested amendment to the policy is too broad and does not materially add to the plan. If developer contributions come forward in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy payments and the community makes clear, at that time, that they would be better spent on other infrastructure items than those in Policy GSC2, then they	No change

Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Ref. No.	Contact Name and Organisation	Part(s) of the Plan to which comments apply	Comments or Concerns	Response	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan
			<p>“Improvement of the community leisure facilities to meet the needs of the residents of all ages will be strongly supported, and should reflect the village demographics.”</p> <p>This is would not prevent the Parish Council from carrying out the projects currently in GSC2, should it prove financially viable to do so after the extra work has been undertaken as set out in 9.16, but would not restrict the council in years to come.</p> <p>As a consequence 9.7 would ned to be re-worded, maybe including the specific detail in GSC2.</p>	<p>rightly should be spent on such items.</p>	

## **Appendix E      Summary of events and activities**

## **Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan – the Community’s chance to shape its future**

### **Kick off meeting Wednesday 24th April 2013 presentation provided via Navigus Planning and Project lead of the Shenstone Parish Council.**

Shenstone Parish Council has determined that it intends to produce Neighbourhood Plan for the ward of Shenstone.

Well researched and structured Neighbourhood Plans with actions highlighting how the parish priorities fit with wider government priorities (including housing needs), are more effective at engaging their mainstream providers (local authorities) than those focused purely on a local audience.

It was important that the plan is to be effective, with weight, so it needs to be able to demonstrate that all of the community have had an opportunity to give their input, and that the key conclusions are those of the community and not personal opinions of the authors.

We also agreed to align our plan with Lichfield District Council policies set out in the local authority’s strategic plan and local strategic partnerships;

### **Work shop – Working Groups 18<sup>th</sup> June 2013**

We commenced by setting up a presentation to those who put their names forward to be involved in the plan and its process.

Presentation outlining working groups structure, and how the process will work with the development of the plan.

- What are the issues we want to address?
- What evidence do we need?
- What are the possible options for addressing each issue?
- What is the preferred option for each issue?
- Working Groups identify key issues

Our process was to be based around what the community needs whilst alignment with LDC strategic plan.

Next action a public event to ask the community about ‘their Shenstone’ Present and refine issues with ongoing work on evidence gathering.

Outline core strategy

Working Groups

- Housing
- Environment & Transport
- Community
- Commerce

### **Steering Group 17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**



It has established a Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to oversee work streams, progress with meetings, and terms of reference. Meetings held on the following dates:-

17.09.13

02.12.13

10.02.14

The purpose of the Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ("the JNPSG") was to design and facilitate a process that will result in the preparation of draft Neighbourhood Plan for Shenstone in order to achieve the respective vision for the ward.

The process will be:

Inclusive – offering the opportunity to participate for everyone who lives or works in Shenstone and the hinterland.

Comprehensive – identifying all the important aspects of life in Shenstone/Little Aston for which we need to plan for the future.

Positive – bringing forward proposals which will improve the quality of life in Shenstone.

Supported – where there is a need for professional support to complete the process.

Tasks

The JNPSG, along with its technical advisers, will undertake the tasks decided.

Prepare an outline process for producing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Promote the process of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan to encourage participation and the submission of views and ideas.

Organise meetings and appoint Working Groups to gather views and consult on ideas. These Working Groups shall comprise the following:

- Working Group 1 – Housing
- Working Group 2 – Transport & Environment
- Working Group 3 – Community
- Working Group 4 – Commerce

Assess existing evidence about the needs and aspirations of the ward.

Liaise with relevant businesses and organisations to secure their input in the process.

Ensure that the views of the full range and diversity of interest groups are sought through the process, as far as this is reasonably possible.

Analyse the views, ideas and proposals received during the planning process and use them to prepare a draft Plan.

Keep the Parish Council fully informed of progress and, where appropriate, present JNPSG meeting minutes for adoption.

Where appropriate, officers from Lichfield District Council and other key stakeholders will be invited to attend meetings in an advisory capacity.

### **Community Engagement 15<sup>th</sup> October 2013**

Our Working Groups have been considering a range of issues and were presented by each group lead at the session held on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

This allowed us to determine – have we got it right and wrong? Have we missed anything?

(‘How can Shenstone continue to thrive as a Community?’)

Venue: Shenstone Village Hall, Barnes Road

This session allowed examination of the issues and our thoughts, also allowing the community to add their comments and views. Whilst this was encouraging we didn’t feel there was sufficient numbers plus sufficient age demographic from the community to really substantiate that we are on the right track. We are also concerned that the wider community do not know we are developing a Neighbourhood Plan, therefore we need to create awareness across community to ensure we get the views of a larger audience.

To that end we agreed to consider further engagement through a survey to the whole of the community via each house hold.

### **Greysbrooke school questionnaire - 16th December 2013.**

What we like about Shenstone & what we would like to change about Shenstone yr 5 & 6

### **Survey to be ratified by each ward and made available for printing by 6th January 2014**

The design of our plan must reflect the views of our community. To date we have been able to narrow down the main priorities (outcomes from previous engagement sessions) which have been identified within a questionnaire. This document was issued to all households within our boundary early January, to enable all residents to have a say in the future of our village

The results of the survey were then presented back to the community at an event held on Tuesday 18th March 2014.

There was a second survey conducted by Lichfield District Council, for the wards of Shenstone and Stonnal for Public transport due to the lack of reliable public transport, not travelling where residents needed to go or at the times when residents need to travel.

A travel survey was designed in consultation with the Neighbourhood Plan groups to assess local bus and train service usage, its popularity and what additional services residents would like to see in the future.

A paper copy of the survey was posted to each of the 1887 households identified within the Neighbourhood Plan areas along with a prepaid return envelope. The survey was also made available online. A total of 469 paper surveys were returned and manually keyed into the SNAP programme. Online responses of which there were 25 were imported via an email link. A total of 494 survey responses were received.

Housing

- 50 to 150 houses or even more to future proof
- Location of development
- Ensure commitment to greenbelt is maintained
- Land owners need to be considered for development proposals
- Stop back garden development profiteering
- Future proof Shenstone with planning policies
- Development on school location, with new school to be built on Lynn Lane

#### Community

- A bigger school to accommodate the needs of the village
- Lack of facilities for the young
- Other sports facilities required?
- Better use of the pavilion
- Improvements for the disabled – train station
- Improvement of pathways signage and walkways
- Create walking paths
- Develop church tower

#### Environment & Transport

- Better access to trains
- Parking at station
- Parking in the centre of the village
- All trains to stop at Shenstone
- Designated parking for doctors surgery
- Issues with HGV's through the village centre
- Speed to be reduced to 20MPH through the village
- Traffic calming
- Cycle routes
- Improvement of Wall Island
- Conserve Lammas land, and provide better use of this location
- Energy costs

#### Commerce

- Retail
- Maintain the retail shops in the centre of the village
- Improve parking and access to frontage
- To develop employment opportunities
- Industrial
- Security & theft is an issue
- Signage to retail & industrial areas is poor and needs to be improved
- To have light industrial units
- Stop HGV from coming through the village
- Alternative access to the industrial area rather than through the village
- Improve mobile phone and broadband signal

#### **Community engagement - 18th March 2014.**

- Survey results

- Transport results
- Feedback session

**Community engagement - 17th September 2014.**

- Draft plan feedback, with preferred options
- Discussion based around drafted policies with further feedback
- Policies in the Plan provide a framework within which planning decisions are made ... but several issues of concern to residents fall outside this remit included as separate section on Non-Land Use Issues

Summary of community engagement sessions:-

April 2013 – Community launch event

October 2013 – key issues

December 2013 – Greysbrooke school

January 2014 – surveys

March 2014 – options

September 2014 feedback plan pre consultation