



# Tibberton & Cherrington Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary of comments submitted to  
the Independent Examiner

Comments received during  
Publication of Tibberton &  
Cherrington Neighbourhood  
Development Plan

Proposals Period 9<sup>th</sup> November 2020 and  
ran to 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021

Date received	Name of contributor	Comments
19.12.20	Historic England	<p>Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Submission Neighbourhood Plan. Our previous comments on the Regulation 14 Plan remain entirely relevant that is:</p> <p>“Historic England has no adverse comments to make upon the draft plan which we feel takes a suitably proportionate approach to the main historic environment issues pertaining to Tibberton and Cherrington. We commend the commitment in the Plans Vision, objectives and policies to support limited well designed locally distinctive development that is sympathetic to the character of the area including its rural landscape character, heritage assets and green infrastructure”.</p> <p>Beyond those observations we have no further substantive comments to make. I hope you find this advice helpful.</p>
04.01.2021	West Mercia Police	<p>Place Partnership Limited (PPL) is instructed by West Mercia Police (WMP) to submit representations to the public consultation on the Tibberton and Cherrington Parish Neighbourhood Plan (TCNP).</p> <p>The TCNP when ‘made’, will provide the planning framework for the Parish over the next ten years. Its policies will therefore be critical to ensuring that developments are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion, as required by paragraphs 91 (b) and 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) (NPPF).</p> <p>Therefore, the purpose of this response is to propose amendments that will enable the TCNP to promote design measures that will reduce crime.</p> <p>It is in this positive and constructive spirit that WMP would like to submit representations in relation to the following parts of the TCNP:</p> <p>Vision – Page 17</p> <p>WMP support the TCNP vision of maintaining the Parish as a safe and neighbourly place to live. However, due to the proposed infill development within the village of Tibberton, it will be important that both new and existing residential areas maintain a safe, secure and low crime environment. This is recognised by the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraphs 8, 20, 35-37, 91(b) and 124-127(f) of the NPPF;</li> <li>• Objective 19 and Policies SP4, HO10, COM1 and BE1 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted January 2018);</li> <li>• Design for Community Safety Supplementary Planning Document (June 2008); and</li> <li>• The National Design Guide (2019).</li> </ul>

In view of the above, WMP propose the following amendment to the Vision:

‘To help shape that future of Tibberton and Cherrington Parish up to 2031 by enabling the community to have a positive involvement in where and how development should take place; working to retain and enhance the Parish’s open character and historic identity; and by contributing to maintaining the Parish as an attractive, safe, secure and low crime environment to live, work and visit.’

Objectives – Page 17

WMP are disappointed that Secured by Design (SBD) has not been included within the list of objectives, given this is a great opportunity in the TCNP to promote safe and low crime risk developments. Therefore, WMP suggests that the following be included:

Rural Character and Housing

(?) Proposals for residential development should incorporate Secured by Design standards where it is reasonably possible to do so.

The inclusion of SBD within the list of objectives is fully in accordance with paragraphs 91(b), 95, 124 and 127 (f) of the NPPF and the following:

- Objective 19 and Policies SP 4, HO 10 and BE 1 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted January 2018);
- Design for Community Safety Supplementary Planning Document (June 2008); and
- The National Design Guide (2019).

By advocating Secured by Design (SBD), it will ensure that developers properly consider the measures involved in designing out crime to create and maintain a sustainable community.

To give a brief summary of SBD, it is a long-running flagship initiative of the National Police Chiefs’ Council (formally Association of Chief Police Officers). Its objective is to design out crime during the planning process. It is a highly respected standard in the sector, supported by numerous public bodies (including Warwick District Council) and professional bodies. SBD is therefore a vital guidance resource for planners. SBD was created in 1989, is available online, regularly updated and consequently there is no danger of it ceasing to exist during the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy RCH4: Design of New Housing – Page 22

Whilst WMP supports the promotion of high-quality environments within the TCNP, it is important that applicants include Secured by Design measures within their planning proposals to maintain crime free and safe environments. Therefore, the following should be included within Policy RCH4:

(?) It incorporates Secured by Design standards where it is reasonable to do so.

Prospective applicants can gain free advice on SBD from WMP's dedicated Design Out Crime Officers and also online from the official SBD website. This will ensure that proposals for residential development in the Parish promote low crime and safe environments for the benefit of everyone.

As stated previously, the inclusion of SBD is fully in accordance with paragraphs 91(b), 95, 124 and 127 (f) of the NPPF and the following:

- Objective 19 and Policies SP 4, HO 10 and BE 1 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted January 2018);
- Design for Community Safety Supplementary Planning Document (June 2008); and
- The National Design Guide (2019).

Finally, the following content of National Planning Practice Guidance explains why strong planning policies concerning this issue are very important to have:

'Good design that considers security as an intrinsic part of a masterplan or individual development can help to achieve places that are safe as well as attractive, which function well, and which do not need subsequent work to achieve or improve resilience... Good design means a wide range of crimes from theft to terrorism are less likely to happen by making those crime more difficult.'

Paragraph: 010            Reference ID: 53-010-20190722  
Revision date: 22 07 2019

Overall, WMP wishes to emphasise that they welcome the opportunity to submit comments to the TCNP and look forward to continuing this positive and constructive dialogue with the Parish Council.

Should there be any queries about this response, please do not hesitate to contact us and we would be pleased to assist.

02.01.2021	Nick Greenall and Jennifer Vickers	<p>We strongly support the full terms and contents of the Tibberton and Cherrington Neighbourhood Plan regarding the future of development in our parish and the establishment of the settlement boundaries around our village.</p> <p>We would like to be kept updated on the progress of the Plan.</p>
22.12.20	Andrew Morris	<p>I wish to make the following observations on this plan (31282)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Its a local plan so hopefully the local voice will be heard</li> <li>2. Its a balanced report which allows for manageable development within the boundary</li> <li>3. It is a clear demonstration of the vision of the parish and its objectives. It looks to the future but does not forget its past and why it is the community that it is and the spirit that it has. It is all to easy to throw that away with over development and Telford and Wrekin planning have threatened to do that many times.</li> <li>4. The parish has had a lot of housing development in the last 5 years and now it is time to ease up</li> <li>5. Small scale development (fewer than 30 more houses) would benefit everyone but would not spoil what exists, if it was limited to that number via infill</li> <li>6. The type of housing to be built should be in character to the Duke of Sutherland design and within the dark sky policy so loved by the village and the wildlife that survives around it</li> <li>7. It would be good to see smaller houses and bungalows built rather than the grand properties that have been raised recently</li> <li>8. The village is rural in spirit surrounded by agriculture and farming and that is key to its continued success. It is NOT a town.</li> <li>9. We have but one shop run by volunteers and one pub. Both must survive</li> <li>10. Cycling, walking and horse riding are key activities within the village and must continue to be protected.</li> <li>11. The green field in the centre of the village must be protected</li> <li>12. Ecology and protection of the rural landscape is vital but the local roads particularly Back Lane and Plantation Road are in an appalling state. The council have let the builders make a total mess of these roads and should instigate long term repairs. The council has taken the developers money but put nothing back into Tibberton and Cherrington. Not even as much as a tree,,,,,,,,,,,,,</li> <li>13. The report is as I have said is detailed, fair, balanced and I fully endorse its conclusions</li> </ol>

21.12.20	Stephen Saunders	<p>Tibberton residents have had to endure a far higher level of development than can be justified by any objective view of local village need. Telford &amp; Wrekin Council only judge development from the standpoint of external growth targets and additional Council revenue. Telford &amp; Wrekin Council have completely failed to maintain the village roads during this period of excessive development. Residents living experience is ignored as construction continues at an unsustainable level. The village environment will be destroyed forever, unless greater planning controls are put in place.</p> <p>The local plan is therefore a step forward, but it will only be of benefit if Telford and Wrekin gives priority to the interest of its current residents, rather than external targets and 'growth'.</p>
10.12.2020	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 09 November 2020.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Tibberton &amp; Cherrington Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: <a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a>.</p>
26.11.20	Coal Authority	<p>Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.</p> <p>Should you have any future enquiries please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority using the contact details above.</p>

11.11.20	Sport England	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</a></p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England’s guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p>
----------	---------------	---

		<p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p> <p>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</p> <p>If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.</p>
--	--	--

20.11.20	Severn Trent	<p>Thank you for your quick response in sending the shapefiles over, this will help a lot to identify the sites on our GIS based platform.</p> <p>I have today made a request for a high level sewer modelling exercise to be undertaken to determine what affect these allocated / developed sites will have on the existing sewer network. I will look to repeat this exercise once it is known as to what the revised allocations of housing and employment sites are as well in the future.</p> <p>I have asked our modellers if they could stipulate a time for when this sewer modelling exercise could be completed, if it is not in the required time of your deadline date, then I will inform you of when we are likely to receive these results. Upon completion of the modelling exercise, I will make a full response to your consultation. Please accept this as a holding response.</p> <p>I hope that the above is in order, but should you have any further queries, then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
25.02.21	Severn Trent	<p>Firstly, please accept my apologies for the delayed response to your consultation. We hope that you may still be in a position to accept our consultation response.</p> <p>Following a high level modelling exercise that was undertaken, the results concluded that in isolation, each site would not have an adverse impact on the sewer network, but when all sites are considered together, there would be a high risk adverse impact on the sewer network. Here is our response :</p> <p><b>Foul Drainage.</b></p> <p>The proposed development plots and overall number of dwellings proposed results in a high risk to the foul sewer assets serving the Village of Tibberton. The proposed number of dwellings is greater than the existing number of properties in the village, and as such would place the foul network at increased risk of flooding. Existing flow from the village drains to a terminal pumping station (TIBBERTON - GREENHOUSES (SPS)), which pumps the flow to Edgmond Sewage Treatment Works, located approx. 2.7km to the east of the village. The increased load on this terminal pumping station will increase the risk of both foul flooding from the upstream network and the risk of pollution to the adjacent watercourse. The pumping station will also be at risk of increased operational issues, due to the pumps operating to a greater extent than they were designed for. A more detailed study would need to be considered to accurately determine the risk to both the pumping station and its associated rising main. Any increase to the existing pump rate would need to consider whether the rising main would be able to convey higher pump rates and due to the long length of this rising main, upsizing this would be a significant undertaking. Any further work on this should also consider improving confidence in the hydraulic model by means of flow surveys, asset surveys and contributing area surveys (in order to assess any potential surface water flows draining to the foul network). The current confidence in the model of surface water contribution into the foul sewer network is low.</p> <p>The individual risk of the smaller proposed development sites will be less than that of the larger sites, however it is important to consider the cumulative effects of all these sites together. It should be noted that a previous risk assessment undertaken in 2017 for a site of 25 dwellings identified that there was a high risk associated with the proposed connection, as such the impact of multiple sites should also be</p>

		<p>considered to be high risk.</p> <p>The ability of Edgmond Sewage Treatment Works to treat the proposed additional flows has not been considered as the hydraulic model is not a suitable tool to assess the STW capacity.</p> <p>Surface Water Drainage.</p> <p>The asset database indicates that the only surface water sewers in the catchment serve a small area in the vicinity of Old Smithy Road. This network is of 150mm diameter and after flowing west along this road, it drains north and discharges to the watercourse near to TIBBERTON - GREENHOUSES (SPS) pumping station. The diameter of the pipe at the outfall is 300mm, however there is a connection between the foul and surface water network in this area, which is likely to act as overflow for the foul network to prevent foul flooding when the foul sewage pumping station is overloaded or unable to operate. Given the lack of surface water drainage available within the catchment, it is recommended that all the proposed development sites consider alternative options of disposal, to include infiltration to ground via soakaways (if appropriate) and utilising the existing ponds that are located around the edge of the village. Any surface water discharges should also utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) to minimise runoff, in order for the development sites to replicate the current greenfield runoff rates of these sites as closely as possible.</p>
10.11.20	Les Harris	<p>Hello, I would just like to bring to your attention that the settlement plan on page 7 of the (PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2020-2031) is not correct regarding my property namely Honey house Tf108NZ</p> <p>it shows only part of my "settlement" on the plan in red line, I have attached a correct drawing showing the rest of my amenity space (red dashed line), this has been used as a garden for the past 15 years and is not open countryside, please could the red line be amended to show my correct settlement, could you also please acknowledge this email, thanks in advance.</p>
14.11.20	Les Harris	<p>Thanks for getting back to me and your help, the email was sent to developmentplans@telford.gov.uk at the same time as sending to the parish council. I am also copying them in on this reply</p> <p>I would like to point out I am not really "making comments" on the plan, I am just trying to make the parish council and the strategic planning team aware that the settlement plan is wrong in that it does not show the full extent of the settlement that is the Honey House; and that I would like this line amending.</p>

17.12.20	Environment Agency	<p>I would have no comments to offer on the Reg 16 Tibberton &amp; Cherrington Neighbourhood Plan. I have re-attached a copy of my response to the Reg 14 consultation for completeness.</p> <p>I refer to your email of the 26 February 2020 in relation to the above Neighbourhood Plan (NP) consultation. We have reviewed the submitted document and would offer the following comments at this time.</p> <p>We have previously worked with Telford and Wrekin Council on their adopted Local Plan submission to ensure those matters within our remit are secured within the strategic framework of the borough. Similarly, it is important that the associated Neighbourhood Plans offer robust confirmation that development is not impacted by flooding and that there is sufficient waste water infrastructure in place to accommodate growth for the duration of the plan period. We would not, in the absence of specific sites allocated within areas of fluvial flooding, offer a bespoke comment at this time. You are advised to utilise the attached Environment Agency guidance and pro-forma which should assist you moving forward with your Plan.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the Flood Map provides an indication of ‘fluvial’ flood risk only. You are advised to discuss matters relating to surface water (pluvial) flooding with your drainage team as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).</p> <p>I trust the above is of assistance at this time.</p>
09.11.20	Ed & Kathryn Roberts	<p>In respect to the proposed Neighbourhood Plan for Tibberton and Cherrington I am certainly in support of such a plan to manage the development of the village in the future.</p> <p>I would however like to draw your attention to the line of the settlement boundary which as currently drawn bisects my property (63 Plantation Road) but also as part of our planning permission for the recent renovations works to our property, TWC/2017/0448, part of this permission is for the erection of a triple garage which is shown outside of this proposed settlement boundary.</p> <p>Could I therefore request the settlement boundary is revised to mirror the full boundary of my property so there is no issue at a later date when the works to my garage commence.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate in contacting me if you have any queries or require any further information in respect to the above.</p>

17.12.20	Ed & Kathryn Roberts	<p>In response to the e-mail below I have attached the following documents which hopefully answer your queries below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Annex A – High level boundary of our property (63 Plantation Rd) in relation to the proposed settlement boundary</li><li>2. Annex B – More detailed plan of 63 Plantation Rd including land usage, in relation to the proposed settlement boundary</li></ol> <p>Both attachments clearly identify that the settlement boundary needs to be on the boundary of our property, 63 Plantation Rd. and not bisecting the property, leaving our garage and gardens sat outside of the boundary.</p>
----------	----------------------	--

# Local Planning Authority's Submission in Respect of the Tibberton & Cherrington Neighbourhood Plan

**Telford & Wrekin Council comments on Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 15 draft version)**

<b>Section/ Policy Area</b>	<b>Page/ Policy Ref</b>	<b>Recommended Suggestion</b>	<b>TWC Reg 14 Comments</b>	<b>Tibberton &amp; Cherrington Response</b>	<b>Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version</b>
<b>Foreword</b>	Page 2	Review use of 'parish' and 'Parish'	Review the use of 'the Parish' and 'the parish' in the Foreword to ensure consistency – this is separate from references to the 'Parish Council'.	All references amended to 'Parish'	
	Page 2	Consider rewording '...will not spoil the open countryside.'	Development can have an impact on the countryside in different ways, including positive benefits. The use of the word 'spoil' is ambiguous and the Foreword could instead state that development should not have a detrimental or harmful impact on the rural character or open countryside (note the reference in paragraph 170 b) of the National Planning Policy Framework towards 'recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside...'	Amended to: '...and which will not have a detrimental or harmful effect on the intrinsic character or beauty of the open countryside.'	
	Page 2	Review use of ampersand (&) and 'and' in references to the Parish Council	The signature at the end of the Foreword is 'Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Council' whereas other uses in the document, including the cover page, is 'Tibberton and Cherrington Parish Council'.	The '&' has been replaced with 'and'.	
<b>Contents</b>	Page 3	Include 'Policy' in 'National and Local Planning	Referencing.	Amended.	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		Policy Framework'			
<b>1. Introduction</b>	Page 5 – first paragraph	The Council reference should read: Telford & Wrekin Council	Referencing.	Amended	
	Page 5 – second paragraph	'...could proceed to a final referendum of all eligible parishioners.'	Only eligible parishioners, in line with Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, can vote in a referendum.	Amended	
	Page 5 – final sentence	Amend reference to neighbourhood planning webpages	<a href="https://www.telford.gov.uk/info/20453/neighbourhood_planning">https://www.telford.gov.uk/info/20453/neighbourhood_planning</a> (If the Tibberton & Cherrington Neighbourhood Plan is 'made' the webpage for the plan will move from the 'designated and emerging plans' section to the 'completed plans' section.	Amended	
<b>2. Setting the context</b>	Page 6 – first paragraph	References to the Borough of Telford and Wrekin should use 'and' not '&'	Consistency with Council referencing.	Amended	
		Clarification on the housing figures and population changes – are	Reference could be made to Annex A which has some dwelling and population forecasts included. The Annex could clarify the assumptions in dwelling increases.	Text added to end of para 2: '...full details of the increases in housing stock and population are given in Annex C.' ( <i>The Parish</i>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		these evidenced?		<i>Profile has moved from Annex B to Annex C).</i>	
		Reword ‘...will definitely be built’ to ‘could be built’	There is no guarantee that sites with planning permission will definitely be built. Applicants have, in most instances, three years from the date of permission in which to commence development.	Amended to read ‘...or are highly likely to be built’.	
	Page 6 – sixth paragraph	Include ‘the’ in ‘...further residential development in the 1970s & ‘80s.’		Amended.	
	Page 6 – eighth paragraph	Reword the listed buildings section.	Referring to grade II listed buildings as ‘the lowest grade’ of listed buildings seems to downgrade them, given 92% of listed buildings are grade II. This section could instead say 17 listed buildings are recorded in the National Heritage List for England as buildings of special historic or architectural interest, of these 16 are listed at grade II, and one is grade II* marking it out as being of particular national importance.  The Neighbourhood Plan could make reference to buildings of local interest in Tibberton and Cherrington. Any policy reference should include Policy	Amended to read: ‘Both settlements have historic cores with 17 listed buildings recorded in the National Heritage List for England as buildings of special historic or architectural interest. Of these, 16 are listed at Grade II and one is at Grade II*, marking it out as being of particular national importance’.  The ‘Primitive’ Methodist Chapel in Tibberton has been included as a building of local interest. Policy RCH1: Conservation of Tibberton’s and Cherrington’s Historic Character’ now includes	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			<p>BE 6 Buildings of Local Interest in the Local Plan.</p> <p>A similar amendment to the second paragraph of Annex A should be made as a consequence.</p>	<p>references to Local Plan policies BE4 – Listed Buildings, and BE6 – Buildings of Local Interest.</p> <p>Annex B (was Annex A) has been amended as above.</p>	
<p><b>3. Why are we preparing a neighbourhood plan for Tibberton and Cherrington?</b></p>	<p>Page 9 – fourth paragraph</p>	<p>Include reference to examination and referendum.</p>	<p>The Plan is only ‘finalised’ in terms of being brought into force when it has been examined and approved through a referendum.</p>	<p>Amended to: ‘...Following consultation with residents and stakeholders, the Pla will be subjected to external examination before it can proceed to a final referendum of all eligible parishioners. Thereafter, its policies will reflect the aspirations of the majority of the people of Tibberton and Cherrington...’</p>	
<p><b>4. Process of preparing the plan</b></p>	<p>Page 10 - chart</p>	<p>Seventh box – reword to ‘Telford &amp; Wrekin Council publicise the Plan for wider consultation’ and include: (Regulation 16)</p>	<p>Clarification on plan preparation stages.</p>	<p>Amended</p>	
	<p>Page 10 – second paragraph</p>	<p>Consider rewording reference to making a decision on a</p>	<p>To clarify, consultation is required under Regulation 14 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Telford &amp; Wrekin Council and consultative bodies had</p>	<p>Para 2 amended to: ‘Further consultation took place in 2020. This second period was held with Tibberton and Cherrington Parish residents, businesses and</p>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		further consultation period.	only been formally notified under Regulation 14 in 2020, not in 2017. The paragraph as currently worded suggests this was an optional stage decision made by the Parish Council (or Neighbourhood Plan Group) because of the levels of housing growth since 2017, whereas it is a requirement of the Regulations.	consultative bodies over a 6 week period between 18 January 2020 and 29 February 2020 in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012'.	
	Page 10 – final paragraph	Amend wording to 'Telford & Wrekin Council's Local Plan 2011 – 2031 was adopted in January 2018'	This clarifies the adoption of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan, and thereafter can be referred to as 'Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011 – 2031'.	Amended.	
	Page 12 – Fourth paragraph	The paragraph could refer to Planning Practice Guidance as well as the NPPF policies	Planning Practice Guidance includes a section on Rural Housing - <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-needs-of-different-groups#rural-housing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-needs-of-different-groups#rural-housing</a> This supplements the NPPF but could be referenced as additional guidance.	Reference included in Para 5 on Page 13	
	Page 12 – Fourth paragraph	Consider amendment to first sentence to include reference to the NPPF.	Suggested amendment '...would conflict with Government policy (NPPF) which seeks to...'	Amended	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
	Pages 11 and 12 – Strategic Framework	It is important to distinguish between Tibberton and Cherrington villages in policy terms	This section provides policy context; it should clarify that Tibberton and Cherrington are separate villages in planning policy terms and it is understood that the Neighbourhood Plan will clarify the distinction between the application of Policies HO10 and HO11 to each village.	Additional text in Para 1 on Page 13: 'However, Tibberton and Cherrington are separate settlements in planning policy terms and this Neighbourhood Plan will clarify the distinction between the Policies HO10 and HO11 (Affordable Rural Exceptions) as they apply to these villages'.	
	Page 12 – Fifth paragraph	Reword the references to Policy HO11 affordable rural exceptions	The Policy HO11 provisions apply outside the five main rural villages and as paragraph 5.3.2.2 of the Local Plan states, new housing may come forward with justification on the basis of local need on sites not normally in accordance with local housing policies. Paragraph 5.3.2.3 adds that such proposals should be directed towards locations that help to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities, rather than be used as a means to gain planning consent for development in isolated locations.	Revised text as suggested inserted in place of existing para at the end of the Strategic Context.	
<b>5. Evidence base</b>	Page 13 – Fifth paragraph	Clarification on the 'Action Plan' reference.	The Parish may wish to consider how the 'Action Plan' that is referenced could link with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and whether any revisions are necessary. For example,	The Parish Council has concluded that the current Action Page in the Parish Plan 2005 – 2006 needs to be updated. Therefore, the reference has been amended to:	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			<p>any areas or issues that have infrastructure implications and whether guiding the provision of infrastructure could be set out, such as infrastructure priorities for new development proposals.</p> <p>This could be included as a non-statutory part of the Neighbourhood Plan, such as an annex which describes proposed actions or projects.</p>	<p>'Other broader issues or those that are not controlled through legislation will be considered as part of the future parish Council Action Plan'.</p>	
	Page 13 – Sixth paragraph	Rewording of final sentence.	The final sentence could be amended to read: 'Questionnaires were circulated to all known businesses and households in the Parish in January 2020'.	Section already amended to indicate that the questionnaires were sent out and responses have been received.	
	Page 13 – Footnote 9	Additional Comment	N/A	N/A	The footnote mentions other Neighbourhood Plans in preparation. Other NP's in Donnington & Muxton and Strichley and Brookside should be included.
<b>6. Neighbourhood plan vision and objectives</b>	Page 15 – Community Amenities objectives	Clarify references in Objectives 1 and 2 towards	The policies, particularly Policy CA1, refers to the protection and/or loss of existing facilities and services. The policies do not explicitly refer to	The wording in Objectives 1 and 2 reflect current realities. The Plan aims to protect the current facilities and increase access for	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		support new facilities and services	<p>support for new facilities and services (Objective 1) or towards enhancing the range of activities and facilities for all (Objective 2). A review of relevant policies that refer to Objectives 1 and 2 should be undertaken, to see if there is scope to include these measures.</p> <p>For example, supporting text to Policy CA1 states that spaces needs to be identified and designated to allow for the future needs of the community. If this issue has been identified and evidenced through plan preparation, could it be included in the policy (or a new policy) and have discussions between parties given an indication of support for this?</p>	<p>all. There is no immediate likelihood of an increase in facilities or services, although it remains in aspiration for the Village Shop and the Village Hall in the future should the demand increase.</p> <p>However, the following additional text has been added to Policy CA1: 'Proposals to expand or replace existing facilities would be supported, where appropriate, especially for a larger Village Hall and Shop, if the demand from an increased village population indicates that these are viable, needed and sustainable'.</p> <p>The development of new facilities refers to the potential to use the 'Field Hut' on the Playing Fields for additional activities, although none have been proposed to date.</p>	
	Page 15 – Objective 5	Clarify wording – 'historic housing'	Clarify the meaning of this objective – is it referring to listed buildings or a more general view of development design and character?	Objective has been clarified by adding: '...is in keeping with other buildings, with a particular focus	The text would benefit from further clarification on what is historic housing, i.e. does it only

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
				on the 'Duke of Sutherland' style of housing.	cover listed buildings, or also buildings of local interest, or other buildings?
	Page 15 – Objective 7	Clarify 'dark sky policy'	References to the Parish dark sky policy in Objective 7 and Policy RCH4 needs clarifying – what is the policy and can it be reasonably enforced?	Objective has been amended to '...To maintain the rural character of the Parish by discouraging developments with street lights or excessive external lighting, thereby retaining the Parish's 'dark sky' lighting policy.	Clarification is sought on the Parish's 'dark policy' is. Is there a policy or a separate document?  If policy is stated within the text there needs to be sufficient evidence to justify the policy wording.
	Page 15 – Objectives 11 and 12	Consider merging these objectives	The two objectives overlap and could be merged together given their similar aims.	Disagree. Objective 11 considers public transport, usually outside of the village of Tibberton. Objective 12 seeks to minimise the use of cars within the Parish by supporting alternative means. Objective 12 has been clarified to state. 'To encourage the provision of alternative, safe and convenient means of travel within the Parish so as to minimise the use of cars and reduce the associated problems of noise, pollution and parking.	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
7. Policies	Page 16 – Policy CA1	Consider policy support for new provision based on issues and evidence collected during the plan preparation	See above comments under the community amenities objectives (page 15 of the draft plan)	<p>There is no immediate likelihood of an increase in facilities or services, although it remains an aspiration for both the Village Shop and the Village Hall in the future should the demand increase.</p> <p>However, the following additional text has been added to Policy CA1: 'Proposals to expand or replace existing facilities would be supported, where appropriate, especially for a larger Village Hall and Shop, if the demand from an increased village population indicates that these are viable, needed and sustainable'.</p>	
		The policy could clarify what 'satisfactory evidence' is required to demonstrate there is no longer a need for a facility.	The supporting text to this policy could refer to marketing evidence, duration of marketing exercises, viability of facilities and opportunities for re-use, and any local/community surveys.	The second bullet point on the re-use or loss of local facilities has been amended to: 'Satisfactory evidence is produced that there is no longer a need for the facility, through marketing evidence, assessment of the viability of the facilities and opportunities for re-use, where supported by local and community surveys'.	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
	Policy CA1 – Additional Comment	Further explanation within the policy	N/A	N/A	'Supported for similar uses' - this is quite vague and could benefit from further explanation to describe exactly what similar uses are.
	Page 15/16 – First Paragraph	Additional Explanation for the Landscape Character Assessment.	N/A	N/A	Consider additional text explaining why the LCA cannot be complete at this stage in the plan. At present the comment is dropped in rather than explained.
	Page 16 – Fourth Paragraph	Additional explanation for issues that will be considered in the Area Action Plan.	N/A	N/A	Is there any further indication as to what 'broader issues' may be addressed through a future Parish Council Action Plan?
	Page 17 - Policy CA2	Clarify the references towards conversion of existing buildings	There is repetition in references towards converting existing buildings within the Neighbourhood Plan area and within the built-up areas of the Parish. Presumably the 'appropriate use and design' tests in the built-up area would apply elsewhere across the Neighbourhood Plan area and this second reference could therefore be	Second bullet point has been amended to: 'Provision of small well-designed new buildings within the built-up areas of the Parish, subject to it being an appropriate use and design'.	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			removed because the first bullet point applies across the entire Neighbourhood Plan area.		
	Page 17 - Policy CA2	The intentions of the third bullet point could be clarified	The supporting text could clarify how it can be demonstrated that the on-going use of a premises or land for employment purposes is no longer viable. Typically this is undertaken through a viability appraisal, consideration of alternative uses and demonstration through a professional marketing exercise for a specified period of time at a realistic market rate which takes into consideration the age, condition and location of the land or building(s), or a combination of these options.	Agreed. The first point of the third bullet has been amended to: 'It can be demonstrated through a recognised form of appraisal that the on-going use of the premises or land for employment purposes is no longer viable'.	The policy now requires an appraisal to be submitted in support of applications for non-employment uses; however, additional text is recommended needed to make this more explicit – it could be added as explanatory text.
	Page 18 – Policy CA3	Clarification on Local Plan Policy EC12 links	The supporting text to Policy CA3 refers to Policy EC12 in the Local Plan. Policy CA3 does not, however, refer to the criteria-based assessment in Policy EC12 which directs new tourism and leisure development to the Borough's centres and requires proposals outside of these areas to demonstrate that they cannot be accommodated in the Borough's centres. The only reference to settlements is in the third bullet point	The Parish Council is content with the current text, however, the third bullet point has been clarified by amending the text to: '...local service provision and is proportionate to its size landscaping and rural location within the Parish,...'	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			<p>of Policy CA3 – ‘...is proportionate to the size of settlement in which it is located.’</p> <p>The Parish may wish to consider retaining this requirement unless they consider it is not necessary for the parish. Clarification would be advised because the supporting text to Policy CA3 states that ‘the Parish Council considers that as Policy EC12 is Borough-wide in nature that some additional criteria relating to the rural nature of Tibberton and Cherrington should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.’</p>		
		<p>Clarification should be provided on schemes outside of Tibberton and Cherrington villages.</p>	<p>The third bullet point refers to proposals being proportionate to the size of settlement in which they are located. Would Policy CA3 support schemes elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan area? Could tourism and leisure schemes outside of the villages, whether existing buildings (criterion four) or new build, be proportionate to the area in which they are located?</p> <p>As a related matter, is there a potential conflict between criterion three and</p>	<p>See above response. The policy applies to the whole Parish, not only the settlements of Tibberton and Cherrington.</p>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			<p>four given that farm diversification schemes are typically outside of the built-up areas?</p>		
	Policy RCH1	<p>Consider revisions to the policy particularly with references to the historic character.</p>	<p>The draft policy covers several aspects of area character, under a title of conserving the villages' historic character. Whilst there is no issue in principle with references to an area's historic character and seeking to reinforce it, there are also areas which are not of particularly historic character, where, for example, a traditionally designed building may look out of place.</p> <p>The policy could focus on the particular historic characteristics of the area including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retaining and reinforcing the characteristic of sandstone boundary walls;</li> <li>• Respecting the characteristic pattern of development which is referred to in Annex A - the linear development of detached buildings within generous garden spaces;</li> <li>• Protecting or enhancing the setting of listed buildings through appropriately sited and designed development;</li> <li>• Only supporting the conversion of historic agricultural buildings to residential use where it has been</li> </ul>	<p>First sentence of RCH1 has been amended to: 'Development proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the context and settings of listed buildings, other buildings considered to contribute to local or historic interest and historic agricultural buildings'.</p> <p>The Policy points have been amended to: Proposals will be supported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make a positive contribution to the Parish through high quality design with buildings respecting the height, size, scale and massing of adjacent buildings, plot width and form</li> <li>• Respect the local identity, <i>characteristic pattern of development and built form of the village of Tibberton, including the use of traditional materials.</i></li> <li>• Retain locally important buildings, structures and</li> </ul>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			<p>demonstrated that no commercial or business use can be found (cross reference with Policy CA2 in the draft neighbourhood plan);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing direction on extensions to historic agricultural buildings or additional buildings within farmsteads – whether such schemes are supported or not, and whether this is subject to particular criteria; and</li> <li>• Not supporting development that involves substantial demolition, alteration or extension of a Duke of Sutherland cottage or other development that harms its significance, including its setting.</li> </ul> <p>References to the built characteristics could be moved to the general design policy instead (Policy RCH4).</p> <p>The policy conformity section should refer to Policies BE4 (Listed Buildings) and BE6 (Local Listed Buildings). Reference to Policy BE5 should be removed because there are no Conservation Areas.</p>	<p>open spaces that contribute to Tibberton and Cherrington’s rural character. <i>Developments that involve substantial demolition, alteration or extension of a Duke of Sutherland cottage or any other development that harms its significance, including its setting, will not be supported.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the historic character of the Parish’s buildings to inform the design concept for new development, <i>including proposals for additional buildings within farmsteads</i></li> <li>• <i>Protecting or enhancing the setting of listed buildings through appropriately sited and designed developments</i></li> <li>• <i>Where the conversion or extension of historic agricultural buildings to residential use is proposed, it will be supported only where it has been demonstrated that no commercial or</i></li> </ul>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
				<p><i>business use can be found (see also Policy CA2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where innovative design is proposed, developments should fit sensitively into the Tibberton's and Cherrington's frontages and street scenes</li> <li>• Retain and/or increase hedgerows, tree cover and sandstone <i>boundary</i> walls, as these are essential components of the village character</li> </ul> <p>Some issues, such as design criteria, are considered to be applicable to both the policy on conservation of the historic character and building design policy.</p> <p>Agreed. BE5 was included in error, BE6 has now been included..</p>	
	Policy RCH2	Clarify policy approach for Tibberton and Cherrington villages	The Telford & Wrekin Local Plan distinguishes between Tibberton and Cherrington villages through policies HO10 and HO11. Policy RCH2 should therefore clarify that market housing may be acceptable on suitable infill	Policy RCH2 amended to: 'In order to protect the rural character and open aspect of Tibberton and Cherrington over the lifetime of the Plan, proposals for new housing development	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			sites in Tibberton; however, only affordable housing exception schemes may be permitted in Cherrington as per Policy HO11 of the Local Plan. Policy RCH2 as drafted does not distinguish between these approaches and could instead be interpreted that Tibberton and Cherrington have a similar housing policy approach.	under policy HO10 within the Tibberton settlement boundary would only be supported on suitable infill sites where they contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness. Only appropriate affordable housing exception schemes would be permitted in Cherrington as per Policy HO11 of the Local Plan.'	
	Policy RCH3	Clarify where development would be supported	<p>The policy indicates where development would be resisted outside of Tibberton village. The policy should clarify where development would be supported – that is, through affordable exception sites in line with Policy HO11 in the Local Plan. The open countryside would apply elsewhere in the Borough. Paragraph 5.3.2.3 in the Local Plan provides guidance on the interpretation of Policy HO11 and Policy RCH3 could refer to this in its policy and/or supporting text:</p> <p>“Such proposals should be directed towards locations that help to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities, rather than be used as a</p>	Additional supporting text to Policy RCH3 states: Development would be supported through affordable exception sites in accordance with the Local Plan Policy HO11. Such proposals should be directed towards locations that help to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities, rather than be used as a means to gain planning consent for development in isolated locations, contrary to the principles of sustainable development.	The last sentence is slightly confusing – keep it simple to just state in the open countryside.

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			means to gain planning consent for development in isolated locations, contrary to the principles of sustainable development.”		
	Policy RCH4	Remove the first sentence	It is not necessary to refer to other Neighbourhood Plan policies in this instance; any proposals would be assessed against the relevant policies in both the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan.	Sentence amended to: 'Where residential development is proposed, the following criteria are to be met.'	
		Clarify the 'Dark Sky' policy	Reference is made to the Parish's 'Dark Sky' policy. A summary or explanation of the key requirements should be provided or a link made available to the relevant policy provisions.  The policy could instead state that light pollution should be kept to an absolute minimum and that new developments should consider appropriate external lighting designs.	Further supporting text: 'Additionally, there was strong support for the policy to maintain the rural nature of the Parish by reducing light pollution and discouraging developments with street lights or excessive external lighting, thereby retaining the Parish's 'dark sky' lighting policy.'	
	Policy RCH5	Separate the two issues – type and tenure; and affordable exception sites.	The two issues covered in this policy should be separated; separate bullet points (numbered) could be provided.	Reference to Policy HO11 is now in RCH2. The last paragraph of the supporting text has been amended to: 'This policy seeks to	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			Reference to Policy HO11 could be included in Policy RCH2.	align the <i>type and tenure of proposed housing developments</i> with the strategy for delivery of rural affordable housing <i>outside the Settlement Boundary for Tibberton as set out in RCH2, the Local Plan policy HO11 and the NPPF.</i>	
		Reword the policy from 'will view more favourably' to 'will support'	Consistency and clarity in policy wording.	Amended.	
		Include reference to Policy HO4 in the supporting text – 'This policy conforms to...'	Reference to housing mix policy in the Local Plan.	HO4 included in references.	
		Include Sport England Playing Field policy	Tibberton playing field is a key element in meeting the anticipated growth needed in the provision of sport for the rural area of Telford and Wrekin. This is highlighted in the soon to be adopted Playing Pitch Strategy for the Borough. As such, a satisfactory evidence definition should be included. The Parish should therefore consider applying Sport England's Playing Field policy – this could be referenced in Policy EOR1.	Additional supporting text: <i>'Tibberton playing field is also a key element in meeting the anticipated growth needed in the provision of sport within the Borough. This has been highlighted in Telford and Wrekin's Playing Pitch Strategy, which is due to be adopted soon. Sport England also have a statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields, with a presumption against the loss of playing field land.'</i>	
	Policy EOR1				

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
			<p>Sport England Playing Fields Policy:  <a href="https://sportengland-production-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/final-playing-fields-policy-and-guidance-document.pdf">https://sportengland-production-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/final-playing-fields-policy-and-guidance-document.pdf</a></p>	<p>No other potential Public Open Spaces have been identified in the Parish. However, additional supporting text has been added to policy EOR1.  <i>'Although the Playing Field is the only Public Open Space (POS) in the Parish, the creation of additional accessible POS will be supported where possible.'</i></p>	
		<p>Amend the policy wording to include 'detriment to the playing field'.</p>	<p>Policy EOR1 could consider amending the wording to include 'detriment to the playing field' (and not just for development upon it) as this is a small field and can be detrimentally affected by the positioning of housing around it affecting its use. For example, in order to play cricket there may need to be the provision of nets to protect residents from stray balls.</p>	<p>Wording of second sentence in Policy EOR1 amended to:          'Proposals which would be detrimental to the Playing Field or for built development other than appropriate community uses on this Local Green Space will not be supported.'</p>	
		<p>Clarify ownership of the playing field.</p>	<p>According to records, Telford &amp; Wrekin Council own the playing field which is different from what the draft Neighbourhood Plan says, although it might be (for schools purposes) designated as the schools playing field to meet set standards. This needs checking.</p>	<p>T&amp;W's map at Figure 3 in the Plan shows that the Playing Fields are in 2 parts, with a separate central section. The Parish Council understands that the comment in Table 1, that the central section is Church land, is correct.</p>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		Clarify protection of the playing field through the policy.	There is no detail about the protection and what this entails. This should identify that it is publicly accessible land. This is a concern given that if it became an Academy it may well wish to enclose its playing field which would mean it (including the only play area in the Parish) would not be available to the general public for use.	Table 1 states that 'TWC have granted [the Playing Field] protection against residential development under the Borough's Green Guarantee Scheme'. It is also stated that Sport England have a role, with a presumption against residential development of playing fields (see above).	
	Policy HB1	Clarification on applying the policy.	The policy as drafted does not specifically relate to planning applications. The policy could be clearer in stating that it applies to planning applications.	Second sentence of Policy HB1 amended to: 'All new planning applications will be expected...'	
	Environment, Open Spaces and Recreation	Include reference to children's play area(s).	There is no mention of children's play and given there is only one play area in the parish this needs protecting and enhancing, possibly through planning obligations, particularly given growth in the village.	Policy EOR1 now states that 'The Playing field, <i>including the children's play area</i> ' ....	
		Support the provision of additional accessible Public Open Space (POS).	There is only one POS in the area and as such there should be additional accessible POS created where possible.	No other potential POSs have been identified in the Parish. However, additional supporting text has been added to policy EOR1. ' <i>Although the Playing Field is the only Public Open Space (POS) in the Parish, the creation of</i>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
				<i>additional accessible POS will be supported where possible.'</i>	
<b>Annex A</b>	Second paragraph	Reword the listed buildings section.	<p>Referring to grade II listed buildings as 'the lowest grade' of listed buildings seems to downgrade them, given 92% of listed buildings are grade II. This section could instead say 17 listed buildings are recorded in the National Heritage List for England as buildings of special historic or architectural interest, of these 16 are listed at grade II, and one is grade II* marking it out as being of particular national importance.</p> <p>Consider including buildings of local interest in addition to the listed buildings within Tibberton and Cherrington. Reference should refer to Policy BE 6 Buildings of Local Interest from the Telford &amp; Wrekin Local Plan.</p>	<p>Amended as per 'Setting the Context' above.</p> <p>Tibberton's 'Primitive' Methodist Chapel has been included as a building of local interest.</p>	
	Third paragraph	The paragraph could mention that smaller infill schemes continue to come	Clarification that other schemes are being approved and built.	Additional sentence added to end of para: 'Smaller infill schemes continue to be approved and built in the village.'	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		forward in the village.			
<b>Annex B</b>	Page B-4	Refer to the 2016 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The reference in Annex C should be updated as well.	An update to the 2016 SHLAA was submitted by the Council as part of the Local Plan examination – refer to documents under reference G2 in the examination library.	Reference included in Annex D ( <i>was Annex C in the Regulation 14 submission of the TCNP</i> ). The 2016 review of SHLAA mentions Tibberton only once, in respect of Site 457, which was deemed unsuitable for development due to the impact of traffic on the village. However, it has since had 25 houses built on the site.	
	Figure 10	Provide references to the numbers and letters on the Rights of Way plan	The referencing in this figure is not clear at present.	Details of the footpaths and bridleways are mentioned under 'Right of Way' on page B- 7. The Legend has been made clearer.	
	Figure 10	Clarify the duplication of No. 1.	No.1 is the only number to be repeated twice, this needs to be clarified alongside the reference for all numbers and letters.	Duplicated No 1 has been deleted. It was showing the 2 halves of the same footpath.	
<b>Annex C</b>	Page C-1	Include reference to Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)	Reference made to the PPG section on rural housing earlier in this response.	Included.	
<b>Other matters</b>	Infrastructure	Consider policy support for infrastructure	The Plan could include a policy which supports provision of better	The supporting text for TCNP Policy HB1 has been enhanced to include specific mention of the	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		improvements in the Neighbourhood Area.	infrastructure such as drainage through new developments. An infrastructure policy could also address issues including rural broadband provision. The policy could refer to any priority projects or infrastructure schemes that could be funded through developer contributions based on the feedback received in the parish survey. This could be used as evidence during negotiations on relevant future planning applications.	poor road junctions with the B5062 in both Tibberton and Cherrington. No other major infrastructure requirements have been identified by the Parish Council. The Parish already has 'superfast broadband (Mentioned in the Parish Profile under communications)	
<b>Habitat Regulations Assessment – Screening Statement</b>	Para 4.2	Amend references to the Local Plan	Remove reference to 'new' Local Plan (it was adopted in January 2018) and 'most recently' (the HRA was the most recent but it was over three years ago and can just be referred to as having been carried out).	Amended as suggested.	
	Para 4.3	Clarify that the Parish/Neighbourhood Plan Group prepared the HRA	The paragraph states that Telford & Wrekin Council prepared the HRA whereas the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Group prepared it.	Amended to state that the Parish Council produced the HRA Screening Statement.	
	Table 1 Policy CA1	Consider previous comments on policy CA1 regarding	The policy does not refer to improvements of facilities at present. See above comments on Policy CA1. The assessment of potential impacts should be amended accordingly.	Additional text added to Policy CA1: <i>'Proposals to expand or replace existing facilities would be supported, where appropriate, especially for a larger Village Hall and Shop, if the demand from an</i>	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		improvements to facilities		<i>increased village population indicates that these are viable, needed and sustainable.'</i>	
	Table 1 Policy CA2	Amend reference to 'within the settlement boundaries'	See comments on Policy CA2 in the main response above. The policy does not just apply to buildings within Tibberton and Cherrington villages.	Text '..within the Settlement Boundaries' replaced with '.. within the Parish ..'	
	Table 1 Policy EOR2	Amendment to assessment wording	The policy is directly related to development and the use of land which requires planning permission. As such, the wording 'does not result in development' could be revised as per the wording of Policy HB1 'This policy might result in enhancements and improvements' and then mention the protection aspects.	Assessment amended to: 'This policy might result in enhancements and improvements and is intended to protect and enhance open spaces and the natural environment.'	
	Paragraph 7.1	Remove reference to 2017	Natural England have had the opportunity to comment in 2020.	Amended to state: 'Natural England has been given an opportunity to comment on this Habitat Regulation Assessment Screening Statement ...'	
<b>Strategic Environmental Assessment – Screening Statement</b>	Paragraph 2.1	Remove 'new' from the sentence	Neighbourhood planning has been in place since 2011.  Para 2.1 'Neighbourhood planning is a new community right' nearly a decade not new	Amended.	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
	Paragraph 2.2	Update NPPF reference to 2019	The 2019 version of the NPPF is the latest and should be referred to, with the quote amended accordingly (see chapter three of the 2019 NPPF for neighbourhood plan references).	Amended to: The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework in 2019, replacing almost all existing planning guidance. Quote replaced with paras 29 and 30 of NPPF 2019.	
	Paragraph 3.2	Refer to Local plan adoption in 2018	Clarification on the Local Plan process including date of adoption. Include this after mentioning the Inspector's Report.	Amended to include adoption of Local Plan in 2018.	
	Assessment table – 1a)	Include reference to Policy HO11	The second paragraph should clarify that Policy HO10 directs a limited amount of new housing development to Tibberton and that in Cherrington and outside the built-up area of Tibberton the exceptions sites policy would apply as per Policy HO11.	Para amended to: 'Telford & Wrekin Local Plan policies SP3 and HO10 supports new development where it meets the needs of rural communities and seeks to direct a limited amount of new housing development in Tibberton to infill sites only. In Cherrington and outside the built-up areas of Tibberton the exceptions sites policy would apply as per Policy HO11.'	
	Assessment table – 1a)	Remove reference to 'lower tier'	The Neighbourhood Plan, once 'made', would not be a lower tier document. It would form part of the development plan for this parish area of Telford & Wrekin Council.	Text referring to 'lower tier' removed.	
	Assessment table – 2f)	Clarify third paragraph	Clarification should be provided on whether the Neighbourhood Plan is	No sites have been identified to date that require protection.	

Section/ Policy Area	Page/ Policy Ref	Recommended Suggestion	TWC Reg 14 Comments	Tibberton & Cherrington Response	Any additional comments following Regulation 15 version
		'designating new sites'	proposing to designate new sites that are currently unprotected. The Local Plan provides this option but none of the Neighbourhood Plan policies at present indicate this (for example, Policy EOR2).	However, as there is a possibility that sites might be identified in the future, the text has been amended to; <i>'.. as well as designating new sites that are identified in the future which are currently unprotected.'</i>	
	Assessment table – 2g)	Amend final paragraph 'The plan proposes to protect and enhance wildlife corridors and green spaces...'	Consistency with Local Plan and draft Neighbourhood Plan policies (see Policy EOR2).	Text amended as suggested.	