

**Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan  
2016 - 2026  
Submission Document  
Consultation Statement**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Section 15(1b) of Part 5. Section 15(2) of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- (a) Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) Explanation of how they were consulted;
- (c) Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- (d) Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

This Consultation Statement provides an overview of each of the above stages of consultation in accordance with Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations. Full details are provided in the reports that support the Consultation Statement.

This Consultation Statement has been prepared by Gloucestershire Rural Community Council with the guidance of Mitcheldean NDP Steering Group.

## Contents

1. Background information and timeframe	Page 3
2. Information provision and publicity	Page 5
3. Steering Group	Page 5
4. Consultation events and activities	Page 6
5. Pre Submission Statutory Consultation	Page 13

## 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND TIMEFRAME

1.1 Prior to the current neighbourhood development plan (NDP), Parish consultation was last undertaken for the Mitcheldean Parish Plan which was adopted in 2012. (App. VIII: Mitcheldean Parish Plan 2012)

The priorities included:

Environment –built and natural

Local Development – highlighting a parish council policy approach to map potential sites and to develop an NDP to address development issues.

Young People

Community Facilities & Sport & Leisure

Community Safety

1.2 A Housing Needs Survey determined that *‘there are 12 households with a local connection who have self-identified themselves in need of affordable housing in the parish. In addition to local households in need, consideration should be given to turnover of the existing social housing stock in the parish when determining the number, type and tenure of additional affordable dwellings required to meet the parish’s need. Also, consideration may be given to forecasted changes in the demographics and the impact of Government policies e.g. housing benefit regulations. It should be noted that some existing affordable housing may be allocated to persons in greatest housing need throughout the District rather than priority awarded to local people.’*(App. VI: Mitcheldean Housing Needs Survey June 2013)

1.3 The aims of the Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan consultation process was to be inclusive and involve as much of the local community as possible during key stages of decision making.

**Fig. 1 Timeline setting out the key stages in the process of developing the Neighbourhood Plan.**

Date	Process	Consultation
18 <sup>th</sup> September 2014	Designation of Neighbourhood Area by Forest of District Council after public consultation	6 weeks statutory consultation on Forest of Dean District Council website before designation
2014 and throughout the plan	GRCC (Gloucestershire Rural Community Council) were engaged for support through the NDP process	Support and advise the group on process, consultation, facilitation, evidence gathering and submission of the NDP.
October 2014	NDP Group formed with Terms of Reference and consultation strategy.	As a working group for the Parish Council to report to the Parish Council, carry out consultation and produce the NDP
Throughout the plan	Meetings with community groups in the first instance to provide information about the NDP, Q & A, provide information on progress and elicit comments	Groups consulted: Mitcheldean Library, Community Centre, 2 Churches ,Gardening Club, Business and Landowners: Primary & Secondary Schools, Shops, Doctors Surgery, Townsend House residential Home, Wilderness Centre, pubs, Barnardo’s Children Centre outreach. Information on website, newsletters, fliers.
March 21 <sup>ST</sup> 2015 9.15 - 2.15	First consultation drop in event (see para. 4.2)	To launch the NDP & scope issues. Consultees- Mitcheldean community; stakeholders, adjoining parishes; FOD District Council; businesses targeted.
March 21 <sup>ST</sup> 2016 9.15 - 2.15	Second consultation drop in event (see para. 4.3)	To explore in detail the issues. Consultees-Mitcheldean community; stakeholders, adjoining parishes; FOD District Council
January 20 <sup>th</sup> 2018	Third consultation drop in event (see para. 4.5)	Mitcheldean community and stakeholders to comment on draft policies and draft plan prior to Reg 14 consultation.

2015 to 2016	Businesses and land owners consultation (see para. 4.4)	Retailers questionnaire Meetings with Surgery Practice Manager and Vantage Point Business Village Manager (see Fig.2),
25 Aug 2018 to 20 Oct 2018	Six week Reg. 14 pre submission consultation (para. 5.5)	Mitcheldean community, stakeholders and statutory consultees
Feb 2019		Forest of Dean District Council were commissioned to carry out the HRA & SEA screening and consulted with English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency on behalf of Mitcheldean NDP

**Fig. 2 Summaries of meetings**

**a. June 22<sup>nd</sup> 2016: Meeting between Kevan Spencer representing Vantage Point Business Village, Jackie Fraser and David Fleming representing Mitcheldean NDP**

The following items were discussed:-

Kevan Spencer said that employment levels on the business park have stabilised at around 3,000 persons, and that the site is currently around 90% occupied. There is a regular stream of prospective new businesses looking for space. Apart from Building 5 there are currently no plans for any radical development. It is currently occupied on a three year short term let; beyond this the building is at the end of its commercial life. There are two possibilities for Building 5, one being to rebuild as new industrial/warehousing, and the second to redevelop the cleared site for residential. The site of this building is allocated for housing in the Forest of Dean District Council's Allocation Plan following representations by the owner Mr Bennett to the local authority and that if residential redevelopment were not to proceed an alternative site within the parish would have to be found in order to comply with the village's housing allocation.

Kevin said there is a vacant plot of land at the main entrance to Vantage Point at Barton Corner but that there are no plans for this plot of land at the present time.

Kevan said that at the present time around 60% of the electricity used at vantage Point is from renewable energy generated by solar panels mounted on the roofs of key buildings at the site. There are microwave telecommunications on its roof that will need to be relocated within the next few months.

There are no plans for the Social Club.

There is a plan to enhance the restaurant in Building 9 and make it more accessible to the general public.

The Farm Plan building is now at its life's end, but there are no plans for its redevelopment at the moment.

The question of heavy lorries for the business park using the High Street, and approach lanes due to poor direction from SatNav equipment was raised. Kevan will look into the possibility of updating the SatNav data base with a new destination for the postcode. Kevan would also look at improved signage to relieve pressure on The Mews.

There are no decisions yet as to the future of The Mews. Jackie said that as it is so prominent any redevelopment would have to be carefully considered, bearing in mind that the buildings do not enjoy listed status.

**b. June 21<sup>st</sup> 2016: Meeting with Gayle Sykes, Practice Manager, Mitcheldean Surgery.**

The following items were discussed:-

Parking: the flower bed at the front of the surgery. It has been considered by the working party that this area could be utilised for disabled parking in an effort to stop parking on the pavement and on the yellow line at the bend in the road as both these areas cause obstruction when illegal parking takes place.

Gayle said that this possibility had been discussed with the Highways department and had been rejected out of hand due to a major water main and also the BT cable route.

There is a small staff car park at the rear of the surgery, but this cannot accommodate any patients' parking.

Gayle said that the practice has around 6,200 patients at the present time, and that until four years ago it remained steady at around 5,800 patients. I told Gayle that there is an allocation of a further 100 dwellings in Mitcheldean under The Forest of Dean Allocations Plan, and also that The George public house site is to be developed for sheltered accommodation(planning consent has been granted for 28 units and caretakers accommodation). Gayle

said that the surgery would struggle to cope with additional patients as funding will be a problem, and also that the practice has to be a freestanding business and be treated as such. However with a new GP starting in August it is hoped that some of the current pressure may ease. There is no room on site to expand due to its confined boundaries, and also the configuration of the surgery building, and the only possible expansion would have to be downwards into the current basement rooms. The pharmacy in Churchill way is independent of the surgery, but it is closely linked. Strategic changes to general practitioners are all government led.

## **2. INFORMATION PROVISION AND PUBLICITY**

2.1 Events were publicised through posters and fliers to local groups, at the Library, Community Centre and the Town Hall. Fliers, the Village Newsletter and the Parish Magazine were distributed personally to all households in the NDP area.

2.2 In addition to key consultation stages, regular updates on the NDP were available through articles in the parish magazine and fliers delivered to all residents and businesses at key stages of the process. Information was also posted on village notice boards. Progress and an opportunity to make comments were made available online through the Mitcheldean NDP website:

<https://www.ourvibrantvillage.co.uk/index.html>

and Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/mitcheldeanparish>

## **3. STEERING GROUP**

3.1 For the purpose of guiding and supporting the engagement and consultation process an NDP Steering Group was established. Gloucestershire Rural Community Council was engaged to support the group through the process. Membership of the steering group has varied over time. Members included: Jackie Fraser, Parish & District Councillor; Sarah Gates, Parish Councillor & business, Tom Mockford, resident; David Fleming, resident; Bill Wadell, resident & accessibility rep; Lucy Smith, resident & small business. Other members who were apart of the original steering group included: Peter Heathcote, resident; Adrian Gargin, resident; Dale-Martin Parker, Emma Jones, Ieuan Roberts, resident & small business; Helen Johns, resident; Andrew Maliphant, Parish Councillor.

3.2 NDP Steering Group meeting notes and reports were sent to Mitcheldean Parish Council after each meeting and posted on the websites. Notes of the Steering Group meetings were sent to Forest of Dean Forward Planning meeting at key stages in the NDP. Open lines of communication were maintained throughout the NDP process.

3.3 The Steering Group developed a communication strategy:

### **a. The Stakeholders Steering Group:**

Meetings will be held 2<sup>nd</sup> Tues of every month at the Town Hall. Cancelled and postponed meetings will be announced at least 3 days in advance.

Terms of reference will be adopted for the Steering Group and working groups and the Steering Group will receive reports from working groups

PC member on the Steering Group will report to Mitcheldean PC meetings

Minutes, time tables, achievements, problems, support required will be sent to PC after each meeting

Email will be adopted as a required means of communication unless alternative communication (post etc.) is stated

### **b. Working groups set up for specific areas of business:**

Report verbally to Steering Committee and share agendas and minutes with the community

Elect their own Spokesperson/Chair & Provide own secretarial support, except where provided by the Steering Group

### **c. Meetings and Information Management:**

The Stakeholders Steering Group Secretary will:

Produce all agendas and minutes, and other documentation including working group papers as necessary and send to Steering Group at least 2 weeks in advance of the meeting.

Act as point of contact and receive all feedback concerning NDP

Hold all documentation in a secure and easily accessible form. Copies of all documentation to be provided to the Secretary

Ensure all NDP documentation is in the public domain

Forest of Dean District Council Forward Planning and other identified partners will be sent meeting documentation

Minutes and publicity material will be approved by the group before publication.

An overall project action plan shall be developed, with specific time lines. Progress will be scrutinised at each meeting and remedial action taken where necessary.

Meetings will be advertised on the Mitcheldean PC website and Facebook page, Mitcheldean NDP and Facebook page, in the Library, Community Centre and on PC noticeboards

### **d. Rules of evidence provided:**

All evidence provided to be made available to the community including relevant statutory documents e.g. Core Strategy

Inclusive consultation: questionnaires, drop in events at different times/days, consult all parish groups & businesses, and link with the primary and secondary schools, use partners to reach older people and those with disabilities. All views to be recorded verbatim

### **e. Publicity and Information:**

Websites; Facebook; Parish newsletter; posters & displays on notice boards and other public places

Leaflets (detailed information) included in local paper distribution, library, shops, and community centre

Consultation events to include questionnaires and opportunities to comment as well as information in an easy to understand format. Opportunities for further comments to be advertised.

Information and opportunity to comment on the NDP website and Facebook page.

Press Releases: to the Citizen, Forester, Review and Radio Gloucestershire

## **4. CONSULTATION EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES**

4.1 Many residents, businesses and community groups have been consulted during the course of undertaking the Mitcheldean NDP. These included an initial launch event to introduce the NDP and to explore and establish the issues; consultations on the emerging plan and meetings with individual groups, stakeholders and Forest of Dean District Council. Meetings with the Forest of Dean District Council included Allocations Plan Document consultation.

### **4.2 NDP First Consultation Drop in Launch Event Saturday March 21<sup>st</sup> 9.15 to 2.15 2015**

The first drop in event summary prepared by GRCC (Gloucestershire Rural Community Council).

#### **General**

The NDP event was held as a drop in session on Saturday March 21<sup>st</sup> 9.15am to 2.15pm in Mitcheldean Community Library with stalls on the area outside. The library is in the centre of the village and attracted people passing in the street, shoppers and library users as well as those who had seen the event advertised (this was the majority of people). There was also a W.I (Women's Institute) parade through the village in the morning.

250 people attended. Numbers were calculated using the library counter which is used to determine numbers attending the library. The average time people spent at the event was 25minutes reading interpretation panels, asking questions, interacting with the displays and filling in the questionnaire.

There were 8 display boards positioned at the front of the library. They showed: changes in the Mitcheldean parish through photographs of about 50 years ago and now; a board with NDP information;

information known about the area so far and why it is important for people to engage with the process. Refreshments were available organised by volunteers.

The event was advertised through: The Mitcheldean Parish website and newsletter which reaches every household in the Parish; Local newspaper advert and press release; Interview about the event on Radio Gloucestershire; flyers which were sent to all parents and carers of children at Mitcheldean Endowed primary school and Dene Magna secondary school; Email invitations to key stakeholders and partners; posters in the parish including the Library, pub, shops, Community Centre.

### Consultation

A questionnaire listed themes which had been prioritised in the Parish Plan and included current issues such as renewable energy. These had to be ranked: very, quite or not important (See Fig.3. Theme Priorities) A comments box invited any other issues or comments. GRCC analysed the surveys. Members of the NDP Steering Group, Mitcheldean Parish Council and the Glos Rural Community Council Community (GRCC) Adviser attended to provide information and facilitate engagement. Attendees were engaged in conversations relating to how Mitcheldean might develop in the future.

### Key Points from the Questionnaire

There were 80 questionnaires returned. Of those 53 were residents, 1 worked in Mitcheldean and 26 used the facilities (1 of these was a volunteer)

The top 6 priorities were:

- Public Transport
- Community interaction
- The landscape setting of Mitcheldean and its views
- Wildlife habitats and trees
- The quality of the park and playing fields
- Design and quality of building

**Fig.3. Theme Priorities**

	IMPORTANCE			Totals
	VERY	QUITE	NOT	
Public Transport	75%	20%	5%	75
Community interaction	72%	24%	4%	75
The landscape setting of Mitcheldean and its views	70%	24%	5%	74
Wildlife habitats and trees	70%	26%	4%	76
The quality of the park and playing fields	68%	28%	4%	75
Design and quality of building	66%	27%	7%	73
Retail / Shops / Facilities	64%	35%	1%	74
Recreation	59%	34%	7%	74
Unused and underused sites and properties	57%	33%	9%	75
Car Parking	57%	38%	5%	74
Residential Parking	48%	40%	12%	75
Buildings / Places of special interest /Heritage	48%	45%	7%	73
Housing	45%	42%	12%	73
Traffic and Road Safety	43%	7%	50%	152
Village Amenities (schools, doctors, library)	43%	7%	50%	152
Renewable Energy	32%	37%	32%	73

### Land use

Maps were available for people to identify areas where they would not like to see development and areas which potentially could be developed. Areas were drawn on the maps. Both residential and economic development were considered

### Fig.4 Potential Development Sites

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	No of responses		NO POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	No of responses
George redevelopment	11		Wilderness	8
Cottrell's	10		Abenhall Parish	7
Vantage Point	8		Land opposite Carisbrook Rd	7
Expand a little behind Cottrell's	3		Gloucester Rd	6
Sheep Field Cottrells/ Tusculum Way	3		Sheeps Field	5
Affordable Housing	1			
Vantage Point but excluding the Mews	1			
Infill	0			

**Comments included:** Make use of brownfield sites; No more monstrosities like the new estate on Gloucester Road; Potential building in Cottrell's yard and the impact on sewers and stream running down Platts Row; Cottrells field has a high pressure gas main going down the field and down Churchill Way; we have not got facilities for new housing. Schools are full and residents have to go to schools in another county; More bungalows; No 3 storey houses; Being a parent in Mitcheldean and am v. worried how the school will cope with classes getting bigger; Sewers overloaded; Stay in old boundaries for development-main road A4136- Stenders Road to Drybrook- Ross Road: no expanding outside village: Developments with wider pavements; Quality of housing - garden; not the same; aesthetically pleasing; in keeping with area; well built; Not matchbox homes, gardens & small front gardens, not all identical: Houses with garages & space & garden, built of Forest stone or timber frame.

#### 4.3 NDP Second Consultation Event Saturday March 21<sup>ST</sup> 2016 - 9.15 to 2.15

The second drop in event summary prepared by GRCC.

##### General

The NDP event was held as a drop in session on Saturday March 19th 9.15am to 1.30pm in Mitcheldean Community Library to present evidence so far and find out issues in more detail. The library is in the centre of the village and attracted people passing in the street, shoppers and library users as well as those who had seen the event advertised (this was the majority of people). 260 people attended. Numbers were calculated using the library counter which is used to determine numbers attending the library.

The average time people spent at the event was 20 minutes reading interpretation panels, asking questions, interacting with the displays and filling in the questionnaire. A survey of priorities was conducted and was analysed externally by GRCC

Members of the NDP Steering Group, Mitcheldean Parish Council and the Glos Rural Community Council Community (GRCC) Adviser attended to provide information and facilitate engagement. Attendees were engaged in conversations relating to how Mitcheldean might develop in the future.

There were 12 display boards. Developers were invited to include their own displays. Two developers included their displays and information.

Refreshments were available organised by volunteers

The event was advertised through:

- The Mitcheldean Parish website and newsletter which reaches every household in the Parish.

- Local newspaper advert and press release

- Interview about the event on Radio Gloucestershire

- Flyers which were sent to all parents and carers of children at Mitcheldean Endowed primary school and Dene Magna secondary school

- Email invitations to key stakeholders and partners

- Posters in the parish including the Library, pub, shops, Community Centre



## Consultation

**Displays:** to explain the NDP, stages & process; information about Mitcheldean – statistics/ services etc.; What is Special?; Themes E.g. transport, business, Types of development – affordable, rented, shared ownership, starter homes, open market.

**Maps:** to show designated NDP area, conservation area, planning applications.

**Documents/ reports:** National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); Forest of Dean Docs: Core Strategy, Allocations Document; SSI/ conservation reports; other relevant reports to Mitcheldean; Character Assessment with templates/notes in folder as evidence; ACRE ONS report

**A questionnaire** requested comments about development& infrastructure

### Fig. 5 Key Points from the Questionnaire

There were 39 questionnaires returned. The main topics were:

TOPIC	Number of comments	%	Summary of Comments
Community Safety	6	15.4	Speeding and improving the zebra crossing
Amenities	9	23.1	Schools, library and community centre
Parking	11	28.2	Not enough parking. Adequate parking with new developments. No parking charges
Housing/ development	35	89.7	Potential sites. Design and character. Building on greenfield sites
Community	2	5.13	Lovely village and enjoy living in it
Environment	4	10.3	Green spaces and character
Transport	2	5.13	Main bus routes
Business	11	28.2	Vantage Point, shops and more employment
Other	8	20.5	Keeping village tidy, dogs.

### Fig.6 Specific comments on Potential Development (% of comments)

<b>SITES</b>	
Vantage Point	8.6% agree housing on the site
Hawker Hill	11.4% want to see improvements around Gooch, the estate agents
Cottrells old bus station –St Michaels church	8.6% agree with development at Cottrells Bus station
Gloucester Rd	5.7% do not agree with increased development on Gloucester Rd
The Mews	2.9% want to protect The Mews
Glebe Close	2.9% do not want development at the end of Glebe Close
<b>RELATED</b>	
Design	28.6% want developments to be in keeping with surrounding buildings
Infrastructure	11.4% want the doctors surgery and schools to have a planned increase with development
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>	20%. A mixture of comments; parking, no development on greenfields; comments on The George development

### Fig.7 What is Special?

1. Natural Environment	46.7%	2. Heritage and Built Environment	73.3%
<b>Views</b>		Town Hall	
View up to the Wilderness		Old Buildings	
Stunning view from Wigpool Lane		Mews	

Stenders Quarry		Churches - Forest Gate and St Michaels	
View across playing field			
Green Spaces			

#### 4.4 Mitcheldean Retailers Questionnaire Summary

The Business questionnaire was sent to retail businesses in the Mitcheldean parish during September 2016. 20 questionnaires were distributed and 16 were collected.

The questionnaire introduction summarised the housing allocation for Mitcheldean and areas for development. There were 4 questions giving respondents the opportunity to comment on each question:

##### 1. How Do You Think This Will Affect Your Business?

10 respondents replied and stated that it would bring more customers and revenue and boost the local economy. One comment did not want it to be at the cost of the friendly community.

6 respondents replied that it would have no effect, one stating that 30% of customers were from outside the village.

##### 2. Do You Have Plans To Expand Your Business?

4 respondents replied that they had plans and 1 that they were currently trying to expand.

11 respondents replied that they had no plans. There was one 'maybe' dependent on 'the future'

##### 3. Have You Any Concerns About Parking/ Access To Business?

11 respondents replied they had no concerns and 5 respondents replied they had concerns, 2 stating the busy road and 1 parking charges.

##### 4. What Do You Think Of The Parking Facilities In General In Mitcheldean?

6 respondents replied that parking was 'OK', 1 respondent saying that parking was good.

1 comment stated that although 'OK' now car park expansion would be needed if development went ahead.

9 respondents replied negatively stating it is chaotic, car parking should be free and issues of road safety.

1 respondent stated parking was 'fair'.

#### Other Comments

There were 8 other comments. 5 concerned parking stating the need for more parking if development goes ahead; 1 concerned infrastructure, stating the need for road and road safety improvements; 1 concerned development not being for local people's benefit; 1 wanted the village to look 'smarter' and any development to be sympathetic to the local character.

#### 4.5 Third Mitcheldean NDP Drop In Event 20th January 2018

The third drop in event summary prepared by GRCC.

##### General

The event took place on Saturday 20<sup>th</sup> January 2018 between 10.00am and 3.00pm at Mitcheldean Library in the centre of Mitcheldean. Refreshments were provided by volunteers.

The NDP displays included generic NDP information, relevant maps, the Forest of Dean Core Strategy and draft Allocations Plan (Mitcheldean allocations), progress to date, the Mitcheldean NDP draft plan document including Vision, Objectives and policies. The draft NDP was available for comment on the Mitcheldean NDP and parish website for 2 weeks after the event. Comments were collected by the Clerk. 103 people attended measured by the counter at the library door and the average time people spent at the event was 30minutes. Four Steering Group members, Parish and District Councillors and Kate Baugh, Adviser from Gloucestershire Rural Community Council, were also in attendance.

The event was advertised through:

The Mitcheldean NDP website and newsletter; Posters in shops and community buildings; information sent to Mitcheldean primary school and Dene Magna secondary school; Email invitations sent to key stakeholders and partners including developers and land owners.

### Consultation

Attendees and were invited to read the information and make comments on the plan. The draft Vision, Objectives and Policies were displayed with a chart to tick whether there was agreement or disagreement. There was also an envelope with each part for comments which were sealed at the end of the event. Not all attendees ticked or commented although many engaged with members of the Steering Group The information was analysed by Gloucestershire Rural Community Council. The numbers are actual numbers of responses. The feedback will be used to modify the plan where appropriate before Regulation 14 consultation.

### Key Points

#### The Vision statement:

“For Mitcheldean to increase employment opportunities whilst retaining the Village community, and at the same time not to detract from the rural aspect.”

There were no agreements, disagreements or comments

DRAFT POLICY	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENTS
Draft Policy H1 Housing within Mitcheldean village	44	0	1.Slight concern of the impact of new housing o the flow of traffic in terms of volume and speed onto the main roads through the village. This concern would increase depending on the size of the housing development. 2.All developments should ensure improvements in services such as doctors, schools and shops - no further conversion from shops to domestic homes. Roads must be a major feature ensuring adequate access - for instance new development opposite Dean Magna. Also parking in high street. 3.Please can George development hurry up 4.The alteration or conversion of existing buildings should not include barns, cowsheds, sheep pens, sheds. These buildings should remain for agricultural use. This would maintain the agricultural nature of the surrounding countryside.
Draft Policy H2 Gateway and outside settlement boundary	39	0	1.No more housing south of Gloucester Road 2.Do not agree that Bldg 5, Vantage Point should be changed to residential. Why demolish industrial units in M/Dean and build new at Cinderford. Money making scheme to benefit no one (but Bennett)
Draft Policy Option B1 Supporting Local Businesses Development and Tourism	33	0	1.Please could we look at supporting more eateries with ?? too to encourage more spend in the village + to encourage more tourism to the area. Hopefully reducing take-away useage which does create a lot of rubbish in the lanes
Draft Policy Option B2 Supporting Local Businesses and Tourism in the protection zone	32	0	1.Please protect St Anthony's Well, Jubilee Rd, Abenhall, Silver Street Wigpool 2.There are plenty of holiday homes which is taken up more homes possible for local people and not giving to the locals only to the people's pockets who own them

Draft Policy Option AE1 - Provision and Protection of Community Facilities	37	0	1.Great Plan. Perhaps we could look at building a proper roundabout at the Lamb pub and then introducing a main entrance to Dene Magna up the field behind with additional housing - thus enabling space for Dene Magna to expand better safer car/ school bus access + egress and the ability for children to walk to school more safely. Thank you
Draft Policy Option AE2 Local Green Space	33	0	1.'Memorial Gardens' should be Community Garden with a special bench in memory of the 3 boys
Draft Policy ENVIRONMENT E1 Protecting the Conservation Area and Encouraging High Quality Design	38	0	1.Developments should fit in with village. No more developments like Freemans on Gloucester Road 2.Alternative materials should be considered for building as local greystone is too expensive and wold make houses unaffordable. Artificial greystone would look naff. 3.(One) 1 parking space per dwelling is clearly inadequate. Bin/recycling storage-agree but should be provided out of sight from roads etc other than collection days
Draft Policy ENVIRONMENT E2 Protecting Heritage Assets	37	0	0
Draft Policy ENVIRONMENT E3 Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character	34	3	1.Can Cottrells Yard be used as a car park? 2.All very well encouraging development within the village and not on outskirts infrastructure must be improved within village centre drains, roads, parking etc spring to mind. They are already poor and neglected and will become a major problem if more housing is allowed in the centre without upgrades to the existing structure. 3.'Harmony' is in the eye of the beholder
Draft Policy Option E4 Biodiversity	35	0	1.Re:E4 item 6. Ambiguous? Should there be 'no' long term ...agricultural need? As this seems to be a contradiction in its current wording
Draft Policy Option T1 Transport and Accessibility	39	0	1.Traffic flow volume and speed is a problem from the zebra crossing to the pub. Increased population will increase the problem- an accident waiting to happen. Illegal parking!!! The problem needs sorting now not later. 2.Traffic flow through Mitcheldean would be improved if parking in the High Street was enforced with penalty notices or ensuring that cars wishing to park in Mitcheldean were directed to the mews thus encouraging people to walk instead of parking outside fast food outlets..

### Comments from the Community within 2 weeks after the Event

Several comments of support for the proposed protection zones; one negative comment regarding the use of forest stone /local materials for house building as they thought it would be too expensive for the developers; 2 attendees had great concern over the condition of the sewage drains in the centre of the village (Platts Row) and strongly felt the drainage system would not cope with more development within the village and an inspection of the system was needed along with new drainage before any more houses were built; a long comment praising the plan and questioning development versus maintaining rural qualities (especially what is to be achieved with development) also questioned infrastructure.

## **5 PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

### **5.1 Instructions:**

Regulation 14 Public Consultation Notice

In accordance with Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Part 5, 14(a)-(c) notice is hereby given that a formal pre-submission public consultation on the Draft Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) will start at 8am on Saturday 25th August 2018 for a period of 8 weeks ending at 12 am on Saturday 20th October 2018.

### **5.2 Schedule 1, Regulation 3 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 Statutory List of Consultees:**

Forest of Dean District Council Planning Dept.; Gloucestershire County Council Planning Dept.; Parish/town Councils – Cinderford, Drybrook, Longhope; The Lea; Highways Agency (now Highways England); Severn Trent Water.

NB. HRA Screening consulted Natural England, Environment Agency, and Historic England.

### **5.3 Local Consultees:**

Stakeholders and residents; Churches: St Michaels & All Saints Church; Mitcheldean Pre-School, Mitcheldean Primary & Dene Magna comprehensive; local landowners; businesses and shops; The Mews businesses & Vantage Business Village; Townsend care home.

### **5.4 Publicity for this stage of consultation**

Publicity included: where to find the draft, how to comment, where to send feedback and closing dates for comment. Access to the draft plan for comment was available in hard copies on demand, at the Library and Parish Council office. Hard copy comments could be left with the clerk. Electronic copies were posted on the Mitcheldean Parish Council and NDP websites, with parish clerk contact details to send comments.

### **5.5 Statutory Consultation Returns Analysis**

The draft Mitcheldean NDP and instructions were emailed to all statutory consultees. At the end of the statutory consultation period, responses were considered and outlined in the following chart. Consultees not included did not respond.

Policy Ref.	Name of person and Contact Details	Comment	Will a change be made a result of this comment YES OR NO	If YES what change will be made, if NO why not.
General	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	It will be helpful for the NDP to be updated to reflect the fact that the Allocations Plan for the FoDD has now been adopted (summary etc) (eg NDP 4.6, 4.7). There may be quite a few updates needed but overall the Allocations Plan is a better and clearer context for the NDP now it is adopted.	YES	Update references to allocation plan
General	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	2. The format of the plan could give greater emphasis to the policies and proposals by placing the summaries of consultation in an appendix or elsewhere. As the plan evolves there will be more consultation exercises to be reported and a separate consultation report will need to be prepared. The plan's explanatory text can explain how the various policies relate to the consultation points made	YES	Add Consultation Statements to Appendix III
General	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	3. The NDP refers to the NPPF, which has been revised recently and cross references to the new version and to the related planning policy guidance would be beneficial (there are some changes which are relevant to NDP preparation, conformity with other plans, SA etc) <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2</a> NPPF and <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> the planning guidance. It may be useful to pick up on the revised NPPF in respect of its support for design etc (NPPF s 12)	YES	Update to new planning policy references
General	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	4. Local strategic planning policies are those in the Core strategy of 2012 but as amended in the Allocations Plan. The latter makes changes to the CS housing provision which is important for the NDP and its conformity. None of the saved policies from the 2005 Local Plan apply (e.g. NDP4.9).	YES	Update to Allocations Plan
Objective 8	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	5. Objectives - 8; some types of development are expected away from settlements and this may need to be reflected in the objective. It may be considered that this should be re worded to something like..."protect the countryside from inappropriate development especially (named areas) which are vulnerable because of their sensitive ... landscapes..."	YES	Change wording
General and H1	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	6. The NDP (6.1) refers to the CS as well as the draft AP. These references could be updated to the adopted AP. The land adjoining the former bus depot is not now proposed to be allocated (map 3). The CS set out the approximate requirement according to its housing provision. The AP superseded this although the scale of the proposed allocations is still broadly the same for the Mitcheldean (they have changed considerably for some other settlements). The precise numbers are less relevant	YES	Update to refer to the now Adopted Allocations Plan  Consider either a new map or remove the map.

		being the numbers required at the time the CS was written using forecasts that are now out of date (see also NDP 1.8).		Include empty Farmplan building in and Townsend House for alternatives/ post 2026 housing development sites to avoid derelict buildings in the centre
General	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	7. (6.1.7) It is likely that housing will usually require 2 parking spaces per unit plus visitor provision. This may be relaxed in the case of schemes like that at the former George PH, but the requirement is usually applied elsewhere even though there is no set standard.	YES	Update all references and policies to 2 parking spaces and visitor provision
H1 and H2	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	8. (6.1.8) The SHMA provides a guide which is now being replaced by a new housing needs assessment. FoDDC may be able to provide additional evidence on this and an update on the current need for affordable housing- please let us know if you would like additional information.	NOTED	(Requested additional information)
H1/E1	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	9. Policy H1- see above re parking minimum. Does the NDP have any evidence that the current “building five” is likely to be available in the plan period (it is allocated in the AP but not expected to deliver over the first five year period). We will review the allocation in the new FoDD Plan. Policy could usefully cross refer to E1	YES	Agree to cross reference to E1 and vice versa. “to be read in conjunction with”
H2	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	10. H2 will the NDP define the “gateways?” A map of “protection zones” would be useful at this point too or ref to your map 8 (second one there are two numbered 8 in this draft). H2 is not compatible with NPPF policies, though it could be amended to impose strict control, or some form of landscape impact policy.	YES	Develop a Landscape Impact Policy
General	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	11. 6.25 could sq.ft and acres have metric equivalents please?6.2.8 needs a policy if NDP wants to retain the retail element- there may be some changes of use that may not need planning permission.	YES	Put in metric (and imperial in brackets) Develop policy for retaining retail element for the Mews Develop policy to retain retail element in the centre – Add to B1
B1/B2		12. B1- is it appropriate to separate some of the uses as employment and tourism may have different impacts, and the policy at present supports some employment outside the main settlement.	NO	Covered in B1 and B2 and impacts reflect the environmental and valued landscape

				sensitivity of protection zone.
Protecti on Zones		13. The protection zone/ area (?)References need to be supported by additional evidence. Policies could also identify trails on a map? Justification needs to reference NPPF/ NPG. The map (8) seems to cover nearly all of the countryside outside the defined settlement. New development in this area is already subject to strict control so what does the protection zone add and what does the NDP wish to achieve by adding the policy? The actual area defined seems to exclude Plump Hill and Wilderness areas above the A 4136 (your view 2 page 43). Is there a particular justification for this (especially the exclusion of the higher ground and woodland)?	YES	Landscape Impact Policy Include Plump – Landscape rather than ecology, statutory forest. Add agricultural soils reference and Carisbrook info, views, ancient settlements Add Reference to Planning policies and guidelines Add trails and footpaths to map
AC1		14. AC1 seems to be addressing a variety of related issues-support/ retention of community facilities, accessibility of them, & their potential local impact. It also refers to space at the schools (explanatory text or allocation) & adds that additional appropriate facilities will be sought by s106.	NO	NDP group felt AC1 was clear
AC2		15. Local Green space, see para 99 etc of new NPPF- the NDP can also refer to the AP important open areas which the FoDDC identify and identify any other green areas that it considers important. The table within the policy could be moved to explanatory text with a list of the areas being retained in the policy itself.	YES	Enhance wording of why valued. Add in valued open spaces.
E1/H1		16. Policy E1 will need some evidence to justify reference to 2 storey design, could say as an alternative “aspects of the design, including height and massing, materials..etc will need to be justified against how they preserve or enhance the conservation Area” Some additional evidence re materials would be helpful as hinted at in the policy clause 3. Is 4 over prescriptive or is there evidence to suggest the need for tight control on materials. Cross reference to H1.	YES	Rewrite to reflect this Additional reference to materials – pictures of good and bad development. Change to “Forest stone or equivalent” Add “rendering and its colouring”.
E2		17. E2 as drafted duplicates national guidance, the advantage the NDP has is that it could (does) identify non designated assets. These could be listed in an appendix or elsewhere.	YES	Add Non Listed Heritage Assets to Appendix I
E3	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	18. The character assessment material (6.4.13...) would be best placed in a separate document or appendix to the NDP itself. Policy E3 could simply say new development must protect and enhance... The landscaping of it is a separate matter which may mitigate any impacts arising. Would it be more appropriate to refer to building with nature in the context of development generally not just under “within the village outside the Conservation Area”?	YES NO	Move Landscape Character Assessment & Views into Appendix III  Nature



		E3 does duplicate some of the policies elsewhere but protection of landscape character is clearly a priority.		Improvement Area requires enhancement not just mitigation hence the detail
	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	19. The landscape character material in particular could form the basis for the protection zone policy and help justify the zones themselves.	REPEAT	Appendix III - Landscape Character Assessment plus Landscape Impact Policy
	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	20. Transport, some of the proposals lie outside the planning policy area and may need to be separated from those that are covered. The plan can still comment on the issues such as parking restrictions in the High Street.	NO	Important to leave in to reflect opinions. Feedback from county was that it was good.
	Nigel Gibbons - FODDC	21. Definition and rationale for protection areas may need to be supplemented	REPEAT	Appendix III - Landscape Character Assessment plus Landscape Impact Policy
	Robert Niblet Glos County Council	<b>Transport Comments</b> This is a sound proposed NDP which both reflects the transport priorities and issues within the Parish, and aligns with the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan and its Connecting Places Strategy for the Forest of Dean.	NO	No changes as the comments agreed and positively endorsed transport policy within the NDP with references.
	Robert Niblet Glos County Council	<b>Ecology (Biodiversity) Comments</b> <u>SEA/HRA Screening advice for the Plan</u> Looking at biodiversity the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the draft consultation version of the NDP appears unlikely. The District Council and Natural England should be able to give a definitive view on these matters if not already.	TBC	Queried and emailed/appointed Alastair Chapman to undertake assessments. Queried with Kate Baugh To be done prior to Reg 15
	Robert Niblet Glos County Council	<u>The Plan Content</u> Paragraphs 4.2, 4.3 and 5.4 should refer to the revised NPPF published in 2018.	YES	Change references to revised NPPF 2018/2019
	Robert Niblet Glos County Council	<u>The Plan Content</u> We can see that the Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records (GCER) has been contacted. The relevant biodiversity constraints have been well identified and appear to have been taken account of in formulating the draft NDP. You may wish to additionally know that the whole parish, excepting the built up area of the village in	YES	LS obtaining more information into the "Mitcheldean Woods Strategic Nature Area". SNA 37

		<p>the centre, has been identified as the Mitcheldean Woods Strategic Nature Area within the Gloucestershire Nature Map which can be seen at <a href="http://gloucestershirenature.org.uk/actionplan/imap.php">http://gloucestershirenature.org.uk/actionplan/imap.php</a>.</p>		<p>Include references to it</p>
<p>B1, B2, AC2, E3 &amp; E4</p>	<p>Robert Niblet Glos County Council</p>	<p>The policies support the conservation and enhancement of local biodiversity which is welcomed (B1, B2, AC2, E3 &amp; E4). Green space, landscape character, ecological networks (wildlife corridors) and SuDS are being given high value. Proposed Policy E4 (Biodiversity) is detailed however it could be clearer and could be improved as suggested below:</p> <p><b><i>Wherever practical and feasible, development proposals should include measures to enhance biodiversity as part of landscaping and building design.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Proposals should include enhancements such as sustainable drainage systems, re-naturalising watercourses, woodland planting, roosting opportunities for bats, the installation of bird nest boxes and the use of native species in the landscape planting.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>In order to <u>protect and enhance</u> <del>preserve and enhance</del> biodiversity within the parish with particular regard to <del>the rarer and notable</del> <u>priority species (such as horseshoe bats and dormice)</u>, <del>and to ensure plus important</del> habitats, wildlife corridors and commuting <del>/foraging/core sustenance zones or foraging areas protected and enhanced</del>, the following policies apply:-</i></b></p> <p><b><i>1 The NDP seeks to protect ancient hedgerows and to preserve and enhance <u>wildlife corridors ecological networks</u> with the addition of native planting.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>2 The NDP supports the retention of agricultural farmland within the <del>in the</del> environmentally sensitive <u>and zones/protective</u> Protection zones <u>this is in addition to the retention and the protection of priority habitats in the landscape.</u></i></b></p> <p><b><i>3 Dark skies are to be preserved in the Protection Zones and <u>all new or altered lighting must not significantly adversely affect bat habitats, roosts or flyways within the parish wherever they found.</u> <del>be bat sensitive and ecologically approved.</del></i></b></p> <p><b><i>4 Applications for new developments of multiple dwellings should follow the principles <u>of and ideally be certified by the "Building with Nature" Scheme*</u>. <del>(ref: Glos Wildlife Trust).</del></i></b></p> <p><b><i>5 The reintroduction and preservation of Traditional Orchards <del>would</del> <u>is</u> be supported where appropriate.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>6 New development, of any kind, <u>{with the exception of appropriately designed extensions on existing</u></i></b></p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Change all with the exception of the phrase "rural need" - too open and undefined.</p>

		<p><i>dwelling,} is not supported in the Protection Zones, unless there is an evidenced based long term agricultural or rural need and there is no <u>significant adverse impact on wildlife or including designated sites, priority habitats, or priority species.</u></i></p> <p>* <a href="https://www.buildingwithnature.org.uk/">https://www.buildingwithnature.org.uk/</a></p>		
General	Coal Authority	Appendix II	YES	No changes were suggested, but info to be recorded in the NDP for future development
General	Natural England	Appendix II	No	No changes were suggested
General	Historic England	Appendix II	No	No changes were suggested
General	Andrew Maliphant	Appendix II	Yes	Parking allocation to be increased in line with policy changes – 2 parking spaces per property with additional visitor parking provision
General	Mike Steward	Appendix II	No	No specific policy change comments were made
General	Gladmans	<p><b><u>Response to Gladman’s Comments.</u></b>  (See also later refused outline planning application (March 2019 – Planning Ref P1994/18/OUT))</p> <p>2.3</p> <p>3 &amp; 3.1.5</p> <p>3.2</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>NO</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>HRA, SEA, and SA will be carried out as agreed by FODDC prior to Regulation 15.</p> <p>Factually incorrect as development plan has been adopted.</p> <p>-</p>

	4.3.	Noted	Amended to "around"
	4.3.4	No	Valued landscaped comply with NPPF 1709
	4.3.6	No	Covered within public consultations
	4.3.8	Noted	Irrelevant
	4.3.9 & 4.3.10	Noted	Landscape Policy and Character assessment to be made clearer.
	4.3.11	No	Basic conditions have been met
	4.3.12	No	In conformity with local plan and NPPF.
AC2	AC2.	Noted	Factually incorrect. LGS/Amenity space to be made clearer.
	4.3.23 & 4.3.24.	Noted	Policy is dependent on the significance of the heritage

				asset – ref NPPF 184.
		4.3.26	Noted	NPPF 170a compliant
		4.3.27.	Noted	Irrelevant – detail provided
		<p><i>Reference to land off Carisbrook Road. Irrelevant. Not in Adopted Allocations Plan. No pre app has been undertaken to date of Reg . 14. No planning application has been made to date of Reg. 14 (Dec 2018)</i></p> <p>Note – Later planning application was made. Outline planning application was refused. (March 2019 – Planning Ref P1994/18/OUT)</p>		