

Stoke upon Tern Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation Responses

Community and Stakeholder Responses

Feedback Index number	Organisation/ Business or Individual Name	Date of Feedback	Policy H1			Policy H2			Policy H3		
			Agree or Disagree with Policy H1 p27	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy H2 p28	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy H3 p28	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action
<b>GB &amp; SB</b>											
1	D&J Lloyd	13/11/17	Agree			Disagree			Disagree	except for extending existing sites	No evidence or reasoning to support comment. Policy already limits size to 8
2	John Tyler	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
3	Helen Tyler	13/11/17	Agree	Consider design, build materials, impact on skyline	Policy D1 addresses some of these. Skyline could be covered by modifying	Agree	Sites should be monitored	Meaning unclear, but could refer to enforcement, which is a matter for	Agree	Sites should be monitored	Meaning unclear, but could refer to enforcement, which is a matter for the
4	P Bartram	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
5	Sue Bartram	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
6	Ian Stevens	13/11/17	Agree			Agree	Concerns over existing sites that have increased and developed	Enforcement is a matter for the local planning authority.	Agree	Concern with comments from NSDC ref unable to govern planning	Meaning unclear.
7	Peter Haines	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
8	Kathy Haines	13/11/17	Agree	Development of existing buildings and brownfield sites	The NP does not make site allocations. Brownfield sites could be part of a site	Agree	Limited extension of existing sites	No change needed.	Agree		
9	Diana Bromley	13/11/17	Disagree	Social housing need transport. Elderly require bungalows	Policy H1 deals with housing mix. D1 includes reducing car dependency and	Disagree	Extension of existing sites is my concern	Unclear why existing rather than new sites is a concern.	not said	No extensions should be allowed	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.
10	Mr B Mansell	13/11/17	Agree			Agree	Enough sites exist already. Would not be in favour of other sites.	No change needed.	Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
11	Mrs J Duddell	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
12	Gareth Williams	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
13	Alison Williams	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
14	Mrs E Bladen	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree	Must be committed to reduce impact on amenities	No change needed.
15	Stuart Bladen	13/11/17	Agree			Agree	I think that the suggested restrictions are suitable and	No change needed.	not said	My only comment would be subject to overall number. I would not want the	Policy can't impose an overall number, but does limit size of pitches.
16	Stephen Taylor	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
17	Sarah Planton	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
18	Pat Peacock	13/11/17	Agree	Whilst I agree all new housing should be affordable the decision should be	Affordable housing policy is in the Local Plan.	Disagree	There are 3 sites that are all static, I do not feel the need more	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	I feel that the area has more than enough travellers site obviously not needed as	Evidence suggest under provision.
19	Kevin Williams	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
20	Richard Williams	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
21	L O'Kelly	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
22	George Riley	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
23	Diana Williams	13/11/17	Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
24	Christine F Talyor	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		
25	Martin Webber	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		
26	Matt Ross	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		
27	Chris Myers	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		

Feedback Index number	Organisation/ Business or Individual Name	Date of Feedback	Agree or Disagree with Policy H1 p27	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy H2 p28	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy H3 p28	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action
28	Geoff Carr	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		
29	Helen Carr	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		
30	Amy Thamai	13/11/2017	Agree			Disagree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
31	Keith Newby	13/11/2017	Agree	but 50 additional dwellings in Local Housing Need on page 2A should read	Make amendment suggested.	Disagree	the parish contains sufficient capacity with the Warrant Road site	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	Ditto but the southern site	Meaning unclear.
32	E Palin	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Agree		
33	A Breeze	13/11/2017	Agree	don't need Clive barracks site where is all the employment coming from?	NP not making site allocations.	Agree	certified tourist sites only	Not a material planning consideration.	Disagree	got enough	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.
34	P J Breeze	13/11/2017	Agree			Disagree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
35	Pete Waters	13/11/2017	Agree			Disagree			Disagree	We have already got two sites in the Parish	Statement of fact. Policy allows growth of existing in addition to new.
36	Mary Tither	13/11/2017	Agree	Emphasis should be on affordable homes, rent or buy	Affordable housing policy is in the Local Plan. H1 sets out range of affordable housing types.	Agree	Visual intrusion is an important factor;also possibility of light, noise, traffic and general disturbance.	Already mentioned in the policy.	Agree		
37	Wendy Eley	13/11/2017	Agree	Yes. Larger houses could be freed up if there were more bungalows around the area	No change needed.	Disagree	No. Enough around Warrant Road and area.	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	?	Warrant road site is larger enough, it needs to be addressed the water coming off site onto main road	Water drainage more a technical issue. Policy on SUDS and permeable surfaces could be considered for the NP.
38	Pat Higgins	13/11/2017	Agree			Disagree			Disagree		
39	John Taylor	13/11/2017	Disagree	The questions of rumours regarding Clive Barracks calls for this to be	Comment unclear.	Agree			Disagree	We already have our quota per head of population need recognition by S.C.	No evidence to support comment.
40	Ruth Newby	13/11/2017	Agree			Agree			Disagree	We have enough	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.
41	Andy Higginson	13/11/2017	?			?			?		
42	V Brimley	13/11/2017	Agree			Disagree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
43	Emma James		Agree			Disagree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
<b>PB</b>											
44	P Welsh	08/11/17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
45	J Butters	05/11/17	Disagree	We have enough low cost housing	No evidence included with comment to support this statement.	Disagree	Roads will not cope with extra traffic	Traffic impact already part of policy.	Disagree	Keep Small Development	Policy includes limit on pitches.
46	B Welsh	08/11/17	Disagree	Dutton Close and Riverside Drive are low cost housing. I don't think we need	No evidence included with comment to support this statement.	Agree			Agree		
47	P Butters	10/11/07	Disagree	Riverside offers adequate affordable housing. The area firstly needs a limited number housing to bring wealth and investment	No evidence included with comment to support this statement.	Disagree	The road network will not support more caravans, particularly the A41 where accidents are increasing	Traffic impact already part of policy.	Disagree	Should remove the ability to grow to 8	NP needs to balance growth with sustainability. Policy strikes a balance.
48	Anonymous	14/11/17	Agree	but more retirement accommodation needed	Policy encourages housing for the elderly.	Disagree	No More	Meaning unclear and no supporting evidence.	Disagree	No More!	No evidence or reasoning to support disagreement.
<b>RW</b>											
115	Daniels	Nov '17	Disagree	Not on Dutton Close	Site allocations already made by Local Plan.	Disagree			Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
116	Nilski Zyg	Nov '17	Agree			Disagree	Risk of overburden for the Parish, what happened to Warrant Road	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	Risk of overburden for the Parish, what happened to Warrant Road Traveller Site	Capacity of the neighbourhood area has been considered.
117	Nilski Viv	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree	There are areas / plots for gypsies / travellers already. All surrounding	No change needed.
118	Lawrence Jane	Nov '17	Agree	Development around hubs	No change needed.	Disagree	Caravan sites will not contribute to the community in any way	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Neither	We have a significant number of pitches already and no more should be allocated	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.
119	Gough Chris	Nov '17	Agree			Disagree	Sufficient in the area	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	Sufficient in the area, permission given for site at Abdo should not be used	NP can't change existing planning permissions.
120	Gough Simon	Nov '17	Agree			Disagree	No need for any more	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	Do not need to expand on approved or temporary sites	NP needs to balance growth with sustainability. Policy strikes a balance.
121	Rafferty Patrick	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree		

Feedback Index number	Organisation/ Business or Individual Name	Date of Feedback	Agree or Disagree with Policy H1 p27	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy H2 p28	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy H3 p28	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action
122	Lawrence Mark	Nov '17	Agree			Disagree		Disagrees, but no comments to explain.	Agree	If ARC14 has identified the need for 19 additional pitches across shropshire, there is no logic to Stoke upon Tern providing 5 pitches or 25% of the total	No change needed. Rationale could be made clearer, perhaps.
123	Wright Elizabeth	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
124	Henneman Richard	Nov '17	Agree	The conversion of redundant agricultural buildings tends to produce accommodation for the more expensive end of the market	No change needed.	Agree			Agree		
125	O'Connor Margaret	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
126	Bliss Roger	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
127	Bliss Alison	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree		
128	Edge Adrian	Nov '17	Agree	Young people who choose to work locally should benefit	No change needed.	Agree	Agree with extensions to existing sites, disagree with development of new sites	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
129	Edge Kate	Nov '17	Agree	For local young people	No change needed.	Disagree		Disagrees, but no comments to explain.	Disagree		No comment made to explain disagreement.
130	Jackson David	Nov '17	Agree			Agree	"Small scale" is the critical factor	No change needed.	Agree		
131	Ford Alfred	Nov '17	Agree			Agree			Agree	As small as possible	Policy includes limit on pitches.
132	Henneman Shirley	Nov '17	Agree			Agree	But care not to further impact on public footpaths	NE1 refers to footpaths.	Agree		
133	Ford Helen	Nov '17	Agree	Social housing Build extension to the council housing, private owners won't like it, where there is a bus service	Meaning unclear.	Agree	Don't know, only well planned ones	No change needed.	Agree	Had a ride to see where gypsies can stay for short term, all rough land been sold for development which is good for employment. Gypsies will keep on finding country lanes which is annoying land owners	No change needed.
134	Parry Carol	Nov '17	Disagree	Married quarters to handed over to Shropshire council	Meaning unclear.	Disagree	There are adequate sites, no need to expand	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	There is already a site in existence	NP needs to balance growth with sustainability. Policy strikes a balance.
135	Parry Richard	Nov '17	Disagree	Married quarters to handed over to Shropshire council	Meaning unclear.	Disagree	There are adequate sites, no need to expand	No evidence or reasoning to support comment.	Disagree	There is already a site in existence	NP needs to balance growth with sustainability. Policy strikes a balance.
137	Laird Estates	Feb '18		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
138	A R Richards	Feb '18		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	

#### Community and Stakeholder Responses General

Feedback Index number	Organisation/ Business or Individual Name	Date of Feedback	Page of Draft NP	Relevant Policy/Section of Draft NP	Agree or Disagree with Policy/Section	Specific Comment Received	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N	Agree or Disagree with draft NP	I would Like to see changes to the Plan' Agree or Disagree	General Comment Received
101	Goodwin Eleanor	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
102	Goodwin Graham	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
103	Davies Maggie	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
104	Davies Michelle	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
105	Rafferty Margaret	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
106	Lawrence Emilia	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
107	Townsin Joan	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
108	Wright Richard	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
109	Powell Vern	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
110	Powell Dot	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
111	Bolton Davy	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
112	Bolton Jean	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
113	Smith Geoffrey	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	
114	Smith Carol	Nov '17		All	Agree	None			Agree	Disagree	

Policy D1			Policy BE1			Policy BE2			Policy BE3	
Agree or Disagree with Policy D1 p29	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE1 p32	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE2 p32	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE3	Specific Comment Received
Disagree	Speed limits are a joke, speed signs are a waste, speed humps are needed.	Traffic management of existing network is a matter for the highways authority.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree	Noise control? Reinstatement to purely residential, should the business	Need to note much home working not a material change of use. Conditions	Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree	Improved internet speed and mobile phone reception	Policy D1 addresses broadband.	Agree	
Agree	Sensitive to surroundings and using existing developed sites	No change needed.	Agree			Agree	Within restrictions of impact on the local area. Improved internet and	Policy D1 addresses broadband.	Agree	
Agree			not said	Traffic consideration	Traffic safety and capacity could be added to list of possible adverse impacts in the	Disagree	Within the home only	Policy applies to dwellings only. Wider business covered by BE1.	Disagree	It depends what they are ameliorating
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree	Second sentence makes no sense	Wording needs to be clarified. Incomplete sentence. Suggest	Agree	Priorities re-use of existing buildings over new developments	Policy enables both.	Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree	Must consider sewage needs re septic tank availability	More a matter for the building regulations. Severn Trent would be	Agree			Agree			Agree	Negative impacts of noise and air pollution must be monitored for
Agree	The only thing that may be covered but I do not immediately see it is some	Points 1 and 5 deal with this.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	

Agree or Disagree with Policy D1 p29	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE1 p32	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE2 p32	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE3	Specific Comment Received
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree	but the second sentence "In order....appropriate." does not make	Wording needs to be clarified. Incomplete sentence. Suggest	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree	New Developments should only be allowed where public transport exists	Addressed in point 4, though clearly limits to what is possible. Also addressed in the non-planning section of the NP	Agree			Agree	Home based businesses should not result in an increase in traffic, noise and air pollution	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	
Agree	Must have more public transport. Speed zone a Must and street lights A41 needs to be speed limit due to accidents	Traffic management of existing network is a matter for the highways authority. Public transport addressed in point 4	Agree	Existing Businesses must keep roads clean, this will keep costs down on council	Not a planning matter.	Agree	impact on Residents must be taken into account	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	
Agree			Disagree		No comment to explain disagreement.	Disagree		No comment to explain disagreement.	not completed	
Agree			Agree	Must be aware that farmers diversify into broiler chicken production =	Residential amenity considered by the policy.	Agree			Agree	
Agree	But only if your policies are adhered to. Good sympathetic design is essential	NP is statutory policy, once made.	Agree	But not to the detriment of the rural environment. Should be non-	Rural environment considered by the policy.	Disagree		No comment to explain disagreement.	Agree	
?			?			?			?	
Disagree		No reasoning given to support disagreement.	Disagree		No comment to explain disagreement.	Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Disagree		No comment to explain disagreement.	Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree	Only Warren Camp and Dutton Close	Policies apply to whole Neighbourhood Area.	Agree			Agree	As long as environmentally friendly and no expansion, i.e.build more	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	
Agree	Only Stoke Camp and Dutton Close	Policies apply to whole Neighbourhood Area.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree	As long as it is not noisy, mechanical based activity (should be office/small scale workshop)	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Disagree	Not on Dutton Close	Policies apply to whole area.	Neither			Disagree		No comment to explain disagreement.	Agree	
Agree	Businesses that attract HGV's should be discouraged	Unclear how it relates to the design of new development. No change.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Neither			Neither			Agree	
Agree	Must blend in though	Policy deals with local context. Should not be prescriptive on style (see NPPF)	Agree			Agree			Agree	Small scale with country roads, impact of noise etc.
Agree	New Property or alteration must blend in	Policy deals with local context. Should not be prescriptive on style (see NPPF)	Agree			Agree			Agree	Need small scale industrial use as will need to monitor noise and traffic
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	

Agree or Disagree with Policy D1 p29	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE1 p32	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE2 p32	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy BE3	Specific Comment Received
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree	Good broadband vital	Policy D1 addresses broadband.	Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree	Sentence No 2 makes no sense	Wording needs to be clarified. Incomplete sentence. Suggest are moving as not necessary.	Agree			Agree	But home based will not function with our current very poor internet provision	This is more a matter of influencing the broadband service providers.	Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree	This all sounds very fine but depends completely on a functioning internet system	This is more a matter of influencing the broadband service providers.	Agree	
Agree	As long as conditions are followed	No change needed.	Agree	Within reason	Policy includes consideration of adverse impacts.	Agree	If disruptive to other residents (maybe work time restrictions)	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree			Agree	Whilst generally supportive - home based businesses utilising many vans can be a nuisance	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	
Disagree	No new large development	Policy requires contextual design.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Agree			Agree	Providing no significant increase in traffic	Traffic safety and capacity could be added to list of possible adverse impacts in the policy.	Agree			Agree	Providing no significant increase in traffic
Agree	Houses already at Tern Hill barracks for local housing needs. It would be good for the army to stay	Army decisions not a matter for the NP.	Agree	Diversifications is already here, modern world	No change needed.	Agree	As long as the business is not noisy and blends with countryside	Residential amenity covered by policy.	Agree	If there's land available
Disagree	Build on brown sites not green	NP not making site allocations.	Agree	Not to the detriment of the area	Policy includes consideration of adverse impacts.	Agree	Yes, but phone and internet is awful	This is more a matter of influencing the broadband and mobile service providers.	Agree	No issues
Disagree	Build on brown sites not green	NP not making site allocations.	Agree	Not to the detriment of the area	Policy includes consideration of adverse impacts.	Agree	Yes, but phone and internet is awful	This is more a matter of influencing the broadband and mobile service providers.	Agree	No issues



Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy CAF1 p35	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy CAF2 p35	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy NE1 p36	Specific Comment Received
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree	Is there a list of identified community assets?	Already in document (Page 18).	Agree	Access should take into account providing ease of access for people with disabilities and the needs of older people and children; <del>wheelchairs, walkers, prams, buggies</del>
	Agree	Local people have got to support local sports area and play park	No change needed.	Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	?			?			?	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree	But needs updating to reflect new position of Tern Hill and possible house numbers	CAF1 addresses this.	Agree	
	Disagree	Not Affordable	Modification of this policy is suggested (see comments on Sport	Agree	More business needed	Business policies cover this.	Agree	
	<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>	
	<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>	<b>There is a special need to ensure users of land for ACCEPTS the environment do not go</b>
	<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>	
	<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>	
Add to notes under the policy to clarify possible negative impacts.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Add to notes under the policy to clarify possible negative impacts.	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>			<b>Agree</b>	



Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy CAF1 p35	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy CAF2 p35	Specific Comment Received	Response/Action	Agree or Disagree with Policy NE1 p36	Specific Comment Received
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree	More needed with opening times extended	Falls outside of the scope of the NP.	Agree	Bus transport needed	Policy D1 and non planning section address public transport.	Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
	Agree	Maurice Chandler needs a major upgrade	Non planning matter.	Agree			Agree	Strongly Agree
	Agree			Agree			Agree	
Add to notes under the policy to clarify possible negative impacts.	Agree			Agree	Red Lion pub should be recognised as a Community Asset. Any plans to convert it should be resisted	Already on list. Policy provides protection.	Agree	Footpath to Wetlands impassable when wet, - improve and enhance
No change needed.	Agree	Schools into Sports follows on from there	No change needed.	Agree	All depends on money	No change needed.	Agree	Is being spoiled by environmentalists, treat environmental assets with respect
	Agree	Need for more sports and recreational areas	Policy encourages this.	Agree	More information for local people	No change needed.	Agree	More emphasis on environmental projects
	Agree	Need for more sports and recreational areas	Policy encourages this.	Agree	More information for local people	No change needed.	Agree	More emphasis on environmental projects

Response/Action	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N	Agree or Disagree with draft NP	I would Like to see changes to the Plan' Agree or Disagree	General Comment Received	Response/Action
			Agree	Disagree	A great deal of work and effort has obviously gone in to producing this plan and the council are to be congratulated. However, how much notice will the faceless people in Shrewsbury take?	
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree	The plan is comprehensive, and if implemented, should enhance the parish and ensure a good future.	
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Agree	In general I agree with the plan but have concerns with lack of planning and regard to law with current gypsy site - especially Warrant Road. More should be done with bus service & availability	This is largely about enforcement, which is a matter for the LPA, and
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree		
			Disagree	Agree	I have concerns of local facilities for schooling, medical facilities, public transport, sewage facility.	Some covered by D1. However, NP can't take decisions on behalf of
			Agree	Agree	Strict planning in respect of the environment	Suggested changes unclear.
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree	Fairly inaccessible "legalese" but seems to protect most planning decisions	
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree	I agree with the plan, as development of housing and businesses take the village forward. However, the needs of Stoke on Tern, schooling, sports facilities must be developed also. The	
			Agree	Disagree	I believe that the plan is a genuine attempt to allow suitable development of the village. No one wants stagnation but by development some restraint is required. I believe affordable housing is	
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree	I think a lot of hard work has been put into preparing this plan and it is my hope that Shropshire Council recognise its importance as it represents the views of local residents	
				not said	I feel that the volume of traffic on Rosehill Road to get to neighbouring parishes (past the school) is becoming a cause for concern	Traffic management a matter for the highways authority. Also covered in
			Agree	not said	I would like to see more affordable homes within the parish to keep families in the parish. This would encourage to keep business local	
			Agree	not said	Affordable homes to help local businesses and basically look after our locals	Affordable and mix policies in Local Plan and NP.
			Agree	not said	More houses for young families to get them on the property ladder	Policy H1 seeks to address.
			not said	not said	More affordable homes within our parish	Policy H1 seeks to address.
			Agree	not said	More development with affordable homes helping to keep families and businesses together. Important that people have the opportunity to encourage, support and spend with local business so	Policy H1 seeks to address.
			Disagree	Agree	not all brown field sites are correctly identified ie Sutton Park. The word 'Parish' should be inserted after every occurrence of Stoke upon Tern when referring to the area covered by the Neighbourhood	No change needed.
			Agree	not said		
			Agree	not said		
			Agree	not said		

Response/Action	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N	Agree or Disagree with draft NP	I would Like to see changes to the Plan' Agree or Disagree	General Comment Received	Response/Action
			Agree	Disagree	Plan looks good	
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Agree	Comprehensive, well presented, polices clearly stated, and I hope that people will read it and respond to it. Page 24-Local Housing Needs. Appendix 2 should be Appendix 1. Page 24-Clive	Check appendix references. Clive Barracks site allocation made by Local
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	not said		
			Agree	not said		
			Agree	Disagree	If we are to have more homes we need to have more businesses to create jobs. Travellers/Gypsies, the Parish Council has already said that we do not want anymore	
Notes under the policy could be added.			Agree	both crossed out	One o the greatest problems with living in a rural area is the difficulty of communication. Therefore, transport is a big issue. Public transport is insufficient at the moment causing increased car use and isolation. Improved communications through the provision of high speed broadband and mobile phone signals benefit business and individuals	D1 and non-planning sections deal with public transport and broadband.
			???	???	Local Parish Council v Shropshire Council Samdev. Local PC should have the last say in are best interest of what we want in our area. Not someone who does not live around here!	Planning law sets out relationship between local and neighbourhood plans.
			Agree	Agree	I would like to see a few bungalows on the Plans	Mix of accommodation encouraged in H1, but can't specify bungalows.
			Disagree	Agree	Fails to identify Sutton Park (former RAF accommodation camp almost the size of Rosehill Ind Est). Also "the Poplars" (Tern Camp) egg production on Industrial Scale.	Meaning unclear, but QB can amend plan if appropriate.
			Agree	Agree	In general this does not apply to Eaton upon Tern for the reason that only two sites are nominated	Meaning unclear.
			?	?	In general opinion of residents in this parish, the whole exercise has been a total waste of time, money and effort. Whilst the idea might have been a great opportunity to do the best for the	Public transport covered by Policy D1 and non-planning sections of plan. If
			Agree	not said		
			Agree	Disagree		
		Agree	Disagree	None		
		Agree	Disagree	None		
		Agree	Disagree	None		
		Disagree	Agree		Needs updating to change the nominated development sites Dutton Close and Warren Camp to "two Community Clusters"	Look at termminology. Revise if appropriate.
		Agree	Disagree		but some change - see notes	
			No opinion	Agree	Yes, would like to see changes to the Plan	Non-specific.
Meaning unclear. Possible non-planning matters?			Agree	No opinion	Complex, bureatic but generally sensible	
			Agree	Disagree	Comprehensive & detailed	
			Agree	No opinion		
			Agree	Agree		
			Agree	Agree		
			Agree	Disagree	Consider major portion of Parish not on major sewerage	

Response/Action	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) response	NP Amended Y/N	Agree or Disagree with draft NP	I would Like to see changes to the Plan' Agree or Disagree	General Comment Received	Response/Action
			Agree	Agree		
			Agree	Disagree	A lot of good work has gone into this	
			Agree	Disagree	There also needs to be an associated plan / proposal to provide the additional services, communications and access to support the plan	
			Agree	Disagree	A plea for a weight restriction on the Stoke on Tern bridge to deter lorries using the road from the A41 Wistanswick to the A53 bypass as a "rat run"	
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Agree	Children from Gypsy and Traveller families enrolling at Stoke school for short periods of time can cause disruption for long term local children	This is a matter for the school.
			Agree	Agree		
			Agree	Disagree		
			Agree	Neither	Use existing brown field sites first, ie old RAF areas first and keep the countryside rural	Site allocations done by the Local Plan.
Project, rather than matter for the NP?			Agree	Agree	Try to emphasise NO increase in traffic levels. Try to include necessity to IMPROVE communications - broadband and telephone	Policy d1 deals with traffic impacts and broadband.
Policy is about environmental protection. However, actual wording is a mix of protection and need to enhance, which may be difficult to enforce in practice. Suggest modification of wording to shift emphasis onto protection of assets and add enhancements to the non-planning section of the NP.			No opinion	No opinion	The country is short of bungalows to rent for the elderly	NP deals with housing mix, but can't specify bungalows.
These could be added to the non-planning section of the NP.			Agree	Agree	Consultation is a good step	
These could be added to the non-planning section of the NP.			Agree	Agree	Consultation is a good step	