

Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of Representations received during Publication and Consultation 24 February - 8 April 2015.

Representation ID	Name/organisation	Policy / Section commented on.	Do they support or object to the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan?	Do they wish to be notified of the decision?	Summary of Representation
PGNP1	G.M. Loadwick	Policies 9, 10 and 11.	Support	Yes	On behalf of the Ramblers' Association, may I say that we would strongly support Policies 9, 10, and 11.
PGNP2	Doug Webb	Section 3, 4, 5, 6,7,8,9. Policy 1.	Support	Yes	I fully support this Neighbourhood Plan. The NPWG have put in innumerable hours to develop it and I feel that it truly represents the wishes of Gnosall residents.

PGNP3	Jane MA	Section 1.	Support	Yes	Looks fine though I would urge that the in any developments pressure is used to ensure maximum planting of trees - preferably along pavements (as in the London streets) for environmental reasons - I'm sure this will not be popular with some sections of the community but I am convinced that aesthetically and environmentally this is a SENSIBLE idea. Please, please try!!
-------	---------	------------	---------	-----	--

PGNP4	B Forrest	Section 3, 5, 7 and 9.	Support	Yes	<p>I fully understand and accept the need for additional housing in the area. I also feel strongly that the wishes of existing residents need to be taken into account. Those who live here currently choose to live here because of the environment and the majority have expressed a clear desire to see the levels of additional housing limited. The village was not designed to reach this size and does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with further population growth. I believe the needs for additional housing should be met by building in locations designed to cope whether that be other urban locations or the development of an entirely new village or town. I would also like to add my thanks to those who have worked diligently to prepare this plan. Welcome support for indoor recreational facilities including a swimming pool.</p>
-------	-----------	------------------------	---------	-----	---

PGNP5	Pat Tweed	All sections.	Support	Yes	Generally support the principles of the plan and prefer CIL contributions to be used for recreational facilities. Support policies in the plan. Policy 6 should include sustainable design and energy efficient construction.
-------	-----------	---------------	---------	-----	---

PGNP6	Gren Knight	Section 1, 6 and 7.	Support	Yes	<p>I feel strongly that despite the landowner's obvious objections (because she has already submitted an application for a large development!) the Audmore Loop area should be designated as a Local Green Area. Footpaths should be improved consistently with this. Currently the Settlement boundary line has been drawn along the boundary of the main field at the western start of the Loop. This leaves the small field adjacent to the lane vulnerable to development. Would like to see the Acres site increased.</p>
-------	-------------	---------------------	---------	-----	--

PGNP7	Water cress cottage	Section 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7	Support	Yes	I agree with the rationale for the housing development targets (para 5.14). I agree that it is important to make use of existing buildings (para 5.23) and to ensure good design in keeping with the setting (para 5.28). I also support the view in paragraph 5.28 that opportunities for walking, cycling and safe play should be maintained and enhanced. I disagree with the proposal to build near Old Barn Close (Site 1). The boundary line excluding the Audmore Loop from development does not include the small area at the bottom end by the grass triangle. To maintain the rural aspect of this area I think this should be beyond the building line.
PGNP8	Linda Louise	Sections, 1,2,3,4,5,6, 8 and 9.	Support	Yes	Wholly agree with the vision of the Plan and in particular in Para 2.1 the view that development should be “environmentally sustainable, planned and

					proportionate".
PGNP10	Sappernala	Section 1.	Support	No	I am in total agreement with this Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan and fully support it.
PGNP9	Ruthellen	Section 5.	Support	Yes	Reference 5.3 I believe that Gnosall has now reached the capacity for new homes bearing in mind the current infrastructure and we have yet to experience the impact on the village of those dwellings that are being, or have yet to be, built. Gnosall is a village not a town and the village centre is already congested with traffic at times. Any extra traffic from yet more homes will have a detrimental impact on village life.
PGNP16	king-ram	Section 1.	Support	Yes	Having read the document I find that it is very comprehensive and I am in agreement with it.

PGNP11	scorpio52	All sections.	Support	Yes	<p>The explanation of the need for and purpose of a SB is clear. However, the SB shown on Map 6 may have a slight glitch. I believe it has been drawn by computer and it can be seen at a glance that the SB surrounds (and therefore excludes) Audmore Loop/Horseshoe. BUT the western edge (near the triangle) appears not to be closely aligned with the lane and thus a small field of triangular shape appears to be included within the SB.</p>
PGNP18	jingle	Sections 2, 3, 4,5,6,8 and 9.	Support	Yes	<p>I agree that the number of houses proposed in the neighbourhood plan - ie: @200 is fair. However, I am concerned about the increase in traffic on the Knightley road and the suitability of the road to handle this increase. The grass verge opposite the Bellway development has already been eroded and rebuilt at least twice and this will only get worse</p>

					if/when the grasscroft building gets under way.
PGNP12	D Deaves	All sections.	Support	Yes	Generally support the principles of the plan.
PGNP13	Andrew Clee	Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4.	Support	Yes	Generally support the principles of the plan.
PGNP14	N Hailes	Sections 1, 2, 3,4,5,6, 8 and 9.	Support	Yes	Generally support the principles of the plan.
PGNP15	A Deaves	Section 1,2,3,4,5,6, 8 and 9.	Support	Yes	The Settlement Boundary does NOT include a triangular parcel of land to the west of the Audmore Loop. This parcel of land must be enclosed within the Settlement Boundary. This parcel of land is part of 3645 as shown on Plan SJ8321.
PGNP17	Fred	All sections.	Support	Yes	Generally support the principles of the plan.

PGNP19	GPF	Section 6.			6.13 With an appropriate Settlement Boundary in place as detailed in Map 6 and more than our fair share of additional housing included, the new boundary must be adhered to. To keep Gnosall as a village it is vital that Wharf Road and Audmore Road are not overloaded with extra traffic. The A518 and Arriva bus route provide the corridor to get people in and out of Gnosall and the Settlement Boundary fits in with that strategy.
PGNP20	Sydney Shenton	All sections.	Support	Yes	Revise the boundary to the western edge of the small field at the western entrance to Audmore Loop in order to protect this small field, which is probably the only remaining example in the village of a cottage with a stone front garden wall with a gate leading on to a paddock, from development. Classify Audmore Loop as Local Green Space.

PGNP21	Robert Galker	Section 1, 2, and 3.	Support	Yes	I agree with the Gnosall Plan as defined.
PGNP22	hopgnos@tiscali.co.uk	Section 1 and 6.	Support	Yes	We are writing to express our general support for the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan, the Vision it contains for our community and the five objectives around which the Plan is structured. In particular, we strongly agree with the new Settlement Boundary proposed for the main village area.
PGNP23	Maxine	Section 1,2,3,4 and 9.	Support		Generally support aims and objectives of the plan. Considers the plan reflects local people's views.
PGNP24	Paz	Section 1.	Support	Yes	Just to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the contents of the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan, and would like to thank all who worked very hard to produce it.

PGNP25	bhwhincup	Section 3,5,6,7 and 9.	Support	Yes	<p>I agree with what the plan says about the importance of the environment to resident's quality of life: easy access to the countryside, protection of green spaces and sites of SSSI. 7.10 I am also concerned that local children do not have many specific leisure facilities especially with the loss of the swimming pool and potential loss of the library and youth club. I agree that these need further consideration in the NP. 7.17 I strongly agree that Audmore Loop should be protected from development and its unique character maintained.</p>
--------	-----------	------------------------	---------	-----	--

PGNP26	Sport England	Section 7.			<p>Sport England acknowledges the loss of a swimming pool in Gnosall along with the desire to invest in recreation and therefore Policy 8 is supported but it should be underpinned by the Borough Open Space, Sports and Recreation Assessment to ensure the NP is compliant with NPPF Par. 73. It is important that any future investment into sport and recreation reflects the outcomes of the study undertaken by the Borough to ensure a strategic approach is taken and provision reflects the needs identified in the assessment as well as community consultation.</p> <p>Protection of local green spaces (of sporting relevance) and investment priorities in local infrastructure for sport, as set out in Policies 11 and 14, should equally reflect the recommendations of the sports strategy referred to above.</p>
--------	---------------	------------	--	--	---

PGNP27	Coal Authority	Section 9.		No	The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP28	Patrick O'Leary	Section 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP29	Tony Griffiths	Section 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP30	Environment Agency	Section 7 and 9.	Support		Reference should be made to Policy N4 of the Local Plan and consideration given as to how new development in Gnosall will comply with the specific requirements of this policy 5. we recommend that reference is made within the Neighbourhood Plan to foul drainage provision given that there is a known history of problems at Gnosall Sewage Treatment works. It is also imperative that adequate consideration be given to the watercourses themselves. No deterioration in water quality is allowed under the terms of the

					Humber River Basin Management Plan and the Water Framework Directive.
PGNP31	Merriel Griffiths	All sections.	Support		Support the principles of the plan.
PGNP32	Nina Geraghty	Section 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan
PGNP33	Jennie Winkle	Sections 1-8.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP34	Denise Grime	No sections.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP35	Ron Winkle	Sections 1-8.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP36	Helen and Simon Air	Section 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP37	Pam Macdonald	Section 6 and 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP38	Cynthia Spencer	Section 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.

PGNP39	Je Dykes	Section 9.	Support		Generally support the plan. With reference points 7.17/18 we would like to see the Audmore Loop land designated for special protection but are pleased that it together with the land east of Plardiwick Road are excluded from the Settlement Boundary.
PGNP40	Vicky Webb	All sections.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP41	Tom Webb	All sections.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP42	Mike Ireson	Sections 1-8.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP43	Sandra Webb	All sections.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.

PGNP44	G Ward	Section 9.	Support		I would like it noted that I support the plan but would like a couple of points to be acknowledged. The scale of potential building behind Old Barn Close and the access to the possible site seems very unacceptable. Very small scale infill would be acceptable as Gnosall has already had large scale developments. I agree with Audmore Loop being outside the settlement area and would like to see it given some sort of protection against any development plans for the future.
PGNP45	The Wards	Section 9.	Support		Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP46	Kate Ward	Section 9.	Support		I would like to register my support for the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan. I feel that developments on a large scale should not be completed and I would like to see some sort of official protection put in place in the near future for Audmore Loop (The Horseshoe).

PGNP47	Pippa Morgan	Section 9.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP48	PAUL C BOSTON	Sections 1,2,3,4,5,6, 7 and 9.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP49	Abbey Monk	Section 3 and 4.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP50	Malcolm S Price	No sections.	Support	Yes	Generally supports principle of Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP51	Ian Mobley	All sections.	Support	Yes	An excellent document which gives clear messages to local and national government on the needs and desires of the local population. It is also clear that no-one expects the village to remain preserved in aspic, but where development is to be sanctioned it should be necessary, appropriate and give heed to the NP.
PGNP52	Gill Oliver	Section 3.	Support	Yes	In general support the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan.

PGNP53	Mary Booth	Section 9.	Support	Yes	In general support the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan.
PGNP54	James Chadwick Staffordshire County Council	Sections 2, 5 and 9.			Suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan might want to link the policies 2 and 4 with the Staffordshire Farmsteads Guidance to assist with facilitating appropriate change within farming complexes. Policies 5 and 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan make reference to development respecting the "character of the area". The Neighbourhood Plan may wish to support these policies by demonstrating the key aspects of the built environment which they consider to be characteristic of the local area and by which to judge appropriate good design. This may include a signpost to the Conservation Area Appraisal (August 2013), which looks at the characteristics of the designated area.

PGNP55	Staffordshire County Council	Section 6 with supporting documents.	Object	Yes	Object to the plan as it fails to include a site (land of Stafford Road) within the settlement boundary that could provide housing development of up to 75 dwellings.
PGNP56	Richborough Estates	Sections 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.	Object.	Yes.	Richborough Estates disagree with the level of housing proposed at Gnosall in the Neighbourhood Plan. Using the population of the village to derive a Gnosall proportion of the housing requirement set out in the Plan for Stafford Borough is considered to be too simplistic and not at all reflective of the villages location or the process of addressing sustainable development. Neither does it address the very important issue of affordable housing need for the village. The mix of housing should reflect the situation at the time of the application, including open market conditions and affordable need. Furthermore, no

					<p>evidence is presented as to why a figure of 40% is utilised. Without such evidence it has no meaning. Contrary to its claim, I do not consider that the Plan conforms to NPPF Policy 50 because the very fact that the policy seeks to promote smaller properties means it is not a plan that promotes a wide choice of housing.</p>
PGNP57	Natural England	Section 1 with supporting letter.			<p>Support the Neighbourhood Plan and offer opportunities to include further protection of local sites and include features into new build or retro fitted buildings to help benefit local wildlife. If the planned housing provision were to exceed the Plan for Stafford Borough proportion of housing and the settlement boundary and Policy 3 require amendment under GNP review (as indicated by GNP paragraph's 5.19-20), it may be that a HRA and/or SEA may be required.</p>

PGNP58	S E Kalaga	No sections.			Supports the plan.
PGNP59	M J Gough	All sections.	Support.	Yes.	Supports the plan in principle but not Policy 3. Suggests 1 and 3 bed properties and flats on affordable sites.
PGNP60	M Kalaga	No sections.			Supports the plan.
PGNP61	Linda and David Marsham	All sections.			Support the plan. Local employment provision is a weakness of the plan. Suggests some amendments to help strengthen the plan.
PGNP62	Rob and Sandy	All sections.	Support.	Yes.	Supports the plan.
PGNP63	Historic England	No Sections.			No further comments to add in relation to a response provided to an earlier draft on 17 January 2015.
PGNP64	A H Kalaga	No sections.			Supports the plan.

PGNP65	A Clark	No sections.			Supports the plan.