

Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018 - 2037

Submission Version

A Report to Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council on the
Examination of the Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan

John Slater BA (Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

johnslaterplanning@gmail.com

13th January 2022

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
The Examiner's Role	4
The Examination Process	5
The Consultation Process	6
Regulation 16 Consultation	7
The Basic Conditions	7
Compliance with the Development Plan	8
Compliance with European and Human Rights Legislation	8
The Neighbourhood Plan: An Overview	9
The Neighbourhood Plan Policies	10
The Referendum Area	15
Summary	15

Executive Summary

My examination has concluded that the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum, subject to the Plan being amended in line with my recommended modifications, which are required to ensure the plan meets the basic conditions. The more noteworthy include –

- Clarify that housing may be capable of being supported beyond the village envelopes if it complies with other development plan policy.
- Removing the requirement that design proposals must “be sustainable”.
- Clarification that two of the Viewpoint B views should be from Station Road looking eastwards.
- Deleting the policy outlining the funding priorities within the parish.
- Amending the policy setting out the need to provide balanced transport proposals to development which will lead to an increase in the number of journeys.
- Revise the village centre policy to include reference to Class E uses.

The referendum area does not need to be extended beyond the Plan area.

Introduction

1. Neighbourhood planning is a process introduced by the Localism Act 2011 that allows local communities to create the policies that will shape the places where they live and work. A neighbourhood plan provides the community with the opportunity if it chooses to allocate land for particular purposes and to prepare the policies that will be used in the determination of planning applications in their area. Once a neighbourhood plan is made, it will form part of the statutory development plan alongside the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 adopted in October 2009 and the saved policies of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan, which was adopted in 2003. Decision makers are required to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
2. The neighbourhood plan making process has been undertaken under the supervision of Madeley Parish Council. A Working Group was appointed to undertake the Plan's preparations which reported to the Parish Council and was made up of parish councillors and local residents.
3. This report is the outcome of my examination of the Submission Version of the Madeley Neighbourhood Plan. My report will make recommendations, based on my findings, on whether the Plan should go forward to a referendum. If the Plan then receives the support of over 50% of those voting at the referendum, the Plan will be "made" by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council.

The Examiner's Role

4. I was appointed by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council in late September 2021, with the agreement of Madeley Parish Council to conduct this examination.
5. In order for me to be appointed to this role, I am required to be appropriately experienced and qualified. I have over 43 years' experience as a planning practitioner, primarily working in local government, which included 8 years as a Head of Planning at a large unitary authority on the south coast, but latterly as an independent planning consultant and director of my neighbourhood planning consultancy, John Slater Planning Ltd. I am a Chartered Town Planner and a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. I am independent of Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council and Madeley Parish Council and I can confirm that I have no interest in any land that is affected by the Neighbourhood Plan.
6. Under the terms of the neighbourhood planning legislation, I am required to make one of three possible recommendations:
 - That the Plan should proceed to referendum on the basis that it meets all the legal requirements.

- That the Plan should proceed to referendum, if modified.
 - That the Plan should not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet all the legal requirements
7. Furthermore, if I am to conclude that the Plan should proceed to referendum, I need to consider whether the area covered by the referendum should extend beyond the boundaries of the area covered by the Madeley Neighbourhood Plan area.
 8. In examining the Plan, the Independent Examiner is expected to address the following questions
 - Do the policies relate to the development and use of land for a Designated Neighbourhood Plan area in accordance with Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004?
 - Does the Neighbourhood Plan meet the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 - namely that it specifies the period to which it is to have effect? It must not relate to matters which are referred to as “excluded development” and also that it must not cover more than one Neighbourhood Plan area.
 - Has the Neighbourhood Plan been prepared for an area designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and been developed and submitted by a qualifying body?
 9. I am able to confirm that, if amended in line with my modifications, the Plan does only relate to the development and use of land, covering the area designated by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, for the Madeley Neighbourhood Plan, on 11th May 2017.
 10. I can also confirm that it does specify the period over which the Plan has effect, namely the period from 2018 up to 2037.
 11. I can confirm that the Plan does not contain policies dealing with any “excluded development”.
 12. There are no other neighbourhood plans covering the area covered by the neighbourhood area designation.
 13. I am satisfied that Madeley Parish Council as a parish council can act as a qualifying body under the terms of the legislation.

The Examination Process

14. The presumption is that the Neighbourhood Plan will proceed by way of an examination of written evidence only. However, the Examiner can ask for a public hearing in order to hear oral evidence on matters which he or she wishes to explore further or if a person has a fair chance to put forward a case.
15. I am required to give reasons for each of my recommendations and also provide a summary of my main conclusions.
16. I am satisfied that I can properly examine the Plan without the need for a hearing.

17. I carried out an unaccompanied visit to Madeley on 16th November 2021. I spent the afternoon around the parish and I visited each of the proposed local green spaces. I made a point of seeing how the village envelopes in both Madeley village and Madeley Heath had been drawn and I noted the role of the London to Crewe railway line in defining the boundary of the Green Belt outside the envelope. I was able to see the two key viewpoints and their relationship with the Conservation Area. I visited each of the 7 community facilities and I identified the 3 junctions referred to in Policy TRA 1. I parked outside the shops in the centre of Madeley village where I saw the range of shops and businesses which are located in that area.
18. Following my site visit, I prepared a document seeking clarification on a number of matters, which I sent to both the Parish Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, entitled Initial Comments of the Independent Examiner, dated 17th November 2021. I received the response from Parish Council on 3rd December 2021 and from Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council on 6th December 2021. I had sought clarification on one matter from the County Council and that was received on 8th December 2021.
19. All these documents have been placed on the respective websites.

The Consultation Process

20. The Parish Council set up a Steering Group in April 2017 and launched its own website in May 2017. An initial questionnaire was distributed during the summer of 2017 to seek initial views on key issues. The group attended various village events such as the Madeley Festival, Dog Show and the HS2 Roadshow as well as holding three days of its own roadshow. The results of the questionnaire were analysed during October and November 2017 and this led to a more comprehensive questionnaire being prepared, which was distributed to every household in the plan area in January 2018. These responses were analysed in February and March 2018 and a total of 785 responses were received. In April and May 2018, contact was made with various stakeholders regarding the evolving plan.
21. There was a separate consultation exercise on the choice of local green spaces which was run from April 2018 through to January 2019. Following the receipt of a health check report which focussed on the local green space and key viewpoints, a second consultation was held in August and September 2019.
22. All this activity culminated with the preparation of the Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan which was the subject of a six - week consultation, known as the Regulation 14 consultation, which ran from 12th February 2020 to 25th March 2020. This was publicised via posters around the village, a website and newsletter sent to all households. The responses to the Regulation 14 consultation are fully set out in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Statement which also describes how the Steering Group responded to the comments made.

23. I am satisfied that the Parish Council has actively sought the views of local residents and other stakeholders and their input has helped shape the Plan.

Regulation 16 Consultation

24. I have had regard, in carrying out this examination, to all the comments made during the period of final consultation, which took place over a six-week period, between 6th September 2021 and 22nd October 2021. This consultation was organised by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, prior to the Plan being passed to me for its examination. That stage is known as the Regulation 16 Consultation.

25. In total, 10 responses were received, including National Grid, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council, Natural England, United Utilities, The Coal Authority, Staffordshire Country Council, Historic England, Etex Ltd, National Highways and Staffordshire Police.

26. I have carefully read all the correspondence and I will refer to the representations where relevant to my considerations and conclusions in respect of specific policies or the Plan as a whole.

The Basic Conditions

27. The Neighbourhood Planning Examination process is different to a Local Plan Examination, in that the test is not one of “soundness”. The Neighbourhood Plan is tested against what are known as the Basic Conditions as set down in legislation. It will be against these criteria that my examination must focus.

28. The five questions, which seek to establish that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions test, are: -

- Is it appropriate to make the Plan having regard to the national policies and advice contained in the guidance issued by the Secretary of State? For the sake of clarity, this examination will look at how the plan has regard to the most up to date version of the NPPF, published on 20th July 2021 and the paragraph numbers of that version will be quoted throughout this report.
- Will the making of the Plan contribute to the achievement of sustainable development?
- Will the making of the Plan be in general conformity with the strategic policies set out in the Development Plan for the area?
- Will the making of the Plan breach or be otherwise incompatible with EU obligations or human rights legislation?
- Will the making of the Plan breach the requirements of Regulation 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017?

Compliance with the Development Plan

29. To meet the basic conditions test, the Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Development Plan, which in this case are the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026, adopted in October 2009 and the saved policies of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan adopted in 2003. It also includes the Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire and the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Local Plan, but the latter two documents are not relevant to the plan as they cover matters which the legislation designates as “excluded development”. Much of the neighbourhood plan area lies within the Green Belt.
30. The plan area falls within the area which is covered in the Joint Core Strategy by the Rural Area Spatial Policy. Madeley sits within the settlement hierarchy as a rural service centre, which is one of a small number of rural settlements which provide the most comprehensive range of essential services and where development is aimed at maintaining the sustainability of the centre. Madeley Heath is described as a village, and is excluded from the Green Belt which surrounds it.
31. The key policy for this area is Policy ASP6 which looks at the delivery of a maximum of 900 net additional dwellings to be “primarily located on sustainable brownfield land within village envelopes, including Madeley, to meet identified local requirements”. High expectations regarding design quality are set out in Policy CSP1.
32. Of the saved policies in the Newcastle- Under-Lyme Local Plan, Policy S3 deals with development in the Green Belt. Policy H1 permits developments within “village envelopes”.
33. The Borough Council in January 2021 made a decision to no longer pursue the preparation of a joint Local Plan with the City of Stoke on Trent and it decided to prepare its own local plan. Work on that plan is in its earliest stages and is not relevant to the issue of general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.
34. My overall conclusion is that the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council Local Plan 2011 and the Joint Core Spatial Strategy.

Compliance with European and Human Rights Legislation

35. Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council issued a Screening Opinion, in a report dated December 2019, which concluded that a full strategic environmental assessment, as required by EU Directive 2001/42/EC, which is enshrined into UK law by the “Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004”, would not be required.
36. The District Council, as competent authority, also issued a screening opinion, again in December 2019, under the Conservation of Habitat and Species

Regulations 2017. This concluded that a full Habitat Assessment would not be required on the basis that the plan would not have a significant impact upon the closest European protected sites, which are Cracow Moss and Betley Mere-Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 RAMSAR site, Black Firs and Cranberry Bog-Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 RAMSAR Site, Wymbunbury Moss- Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 RAMSAR site and West Midland Mosses SAC, Oakhanger Moss – West Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 RAMSAR site and Cop Mere – Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 RAMSAR site.

37. I am satisfied that the basic conditions regarding compliance with European legislation, including the more recent basic condition regarding compliance with the Habitat Regulations, are met. I am also content that the Plan has no conflict with the Human Rights Act.

The Neighbourhood Plan: An Overview

38. I commend the Parish Council for producing a neighbourhood plan that has chosen to focus only on the matters which have been identified as important by the local community. It has not, for example, sought to allocate land for housing and employment and will leave that to the forthcoming local planning process.
39. I applaud the care has been taken in the choices of the local green spaces which have been driven by extensive local consultation.
40. The plan sets out clear expectations in terms of the type of new housing which will take place within the two settlements and sets out clear design aspirations. It seeks to focus new residential development within the two village envelopes which reflects the fact that almost half the plan area lies within the Green Belt and the remainder is attractive countryside.
41. I am impressed by the clarity of the document and the maps and in particular the excellent use of photographs in Appendix 1. It is clear that a great deal of time and trouble has been taken on the presentation of the document.
42. I have made only a limited number of modification recommendations, which are generally necessary to bring the policy into line with Secretary of State policy and advice and the legal requirements as to what constitutes a neighbourhood plan policy. It is important that the policies are ones that can be used to determine planning applications. As a plan which will sit alongside the existing local plan policy, I consider that it provides a locally distinctive dimension to those policies and the plans will complement each other.
43. The plan delivers a clear community vision articulated by the Parish Council and is supported by extensive community engagement and a substantial evidence base. As a plan it strives to protect the green spaces and community facilities that are clearly valued by residents, it sets high design expectations specifically in the conservation areas, while still protecting the natural environment. The plan includes positive policies to support businesses located in the heart of the village. This combination of policies leads me to the overall conclusion that the plan meets the basic condition of supporting the delivery of sustainable development.

44. My recommendations have concentrated particularly on the wording of the actual policies against which planning applications will be considered. It is beyond my remit as examiner, to comprehensively recommend all editorial changes to the supporting text. Such changes are likely as a result of my recommendations, in order that the Plan will still read as a coherent planning document.
45. Following the publication of this report, I would urge the Parish Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme's planners to work closely together to incorporate the appropriate changes which will ensure that the text and policies of the Referendum Version of the neighbourhood plan accord with my recommended modifications. There may also need to be editorial matters to resolve such as policy numbering, as a consequence of my recommended changes.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan Policies

Policy LGS: Local Green Space Designation

46. The criteria set in the NPPF as to which green spaces justify designation as local green space (LGS) are clearly set out and as an examiner, I need to be satisfied that the requirements have been met. The plan is promoting five sites for this highest level of protection that can be conferred on open green space. I am aware that the Parish Council has undertaken extensive consultation with the local community and landowners on the choice of sites. I note that the topic of local green space was looked in detail by a fellow examiner as part of his health check of this plan and the Parish Council accepted and implemented all his recommendations.
47. The inclusion of two sites that have been challenged at Regulation 16 stage, namely the full extent of the Doctors Field site - LGS1 and the inclusion of College Field- LGS 2.
48. The Borough Council in its Regulation 16 comments were concerned regarding the inclusion of an agricultural field on the eastern side of site LGS1. Its concerns were not necessarily related to the specifics of this site, but the precedent it says would be set for other neighbourhood plans to include agricultural land as LGS. I noted that there was a public footpath crossing the site so there is a degree of public access, but it also is important as an area which forms the setting of the village and in particular the parish church.
49. The Secretary of State in his guidance or policy advice contains no restrictions on the inclusion of agricultural land as local green space. I am aware of many cases where farmland has been deemed to have local significance for various reasons and are special to the local community. They have been included as LGS. Whilst it is true that the land may be within the Green Belt, there is specific provision for this in the PPG which states that it can still be designated as local green space as it is a demonstration that the land is valued by the local community.
50. Staffordshire County Council has objected to the inclusion of College Field as one of the LGSs. Whilst the County owns some of the land, it has leased it on a

125-year lease to the local secondary school, Madeley High School Academy Trust. The proposed designation, not just includes the land leased to the school, but also the woodland which fronts onto Newcastle Road and it also includes a children's play area.

51. Notwithstanding the fact that the County Council claimed that their part of the site was fenced, it was plain to me that the site has unrestricted public access which I witnessed for myself during my site visit. In my Initial Comments document, I asked questions of how the school used to that site and I was advised that it is not currently used as school playing fields and is not used for any educational purposes. The County Council's response to my questions pointed out that the trust appeared to be in breach of some of the tenancy conditions including the requirement for the site to be fenced. I think it is somewhat disappointing if the County Council were to exclude the public from this green space and treat their residents as trespassers, if this land is not actively being used by the school. However, these are essentially private matters between the school's management and the County Council and does not have a bearing on my conclusions with regard to how the land is likely to be viewed by the community.
52. My conclusion is that local residents who live around the site do use the green space on an informal but regular basis. The Parish Council has informed me that the land has been used for the village fair on a few occasions. The granting of local green space status does not confer rights or expectations of public access, but by offering LGS status it is recognising the value that the community place on this open space. I am satisfied that evidence has demonstrated that local residents do value College Field as a green space and it does hold local significance both for informal recreation and its visual amenity.
53. In my opinion, the Parish Council has, within Appendix 1 provided comprehensive evidence which demonstrates that all five sites meet the NPPF's criteria for LGS status.
54. I also consider the policy for considering development which affect the LGS sites is consistent with the approach set out by the Secretary of State in paragraph 103 of the NPPF.
55. I do not need to make any recommendations regarding this policy.

Policy HOU 1: Housing Development

56. My only concern regarding this policy is that it could be implied that housing development outside the village will not be supported. Whilst the policy is worded in a positive fashion, stating that housing will be approved within the village envelope, subject to meeting three criteria, I consider it would assist decision makers if the policy acknowledges that there will also be instances where housing development beyond the settlement boundary, but within the plan area such as rural exception sites, conversions of existing buildings, agricultural worker accommodation etc. could be approved. I propose an amendment to make that

clear that other development plan policies may also be relevant to development proposals.

57. A planning policy will be quoted in documents beyond the neighbourhood plan itself, such as on planning decision notices. It will therefore be clearer if extraneous text such as “see plan in the following pages” be removed as it would not make sense in a different context.
58. The village envelope used in the plan follows the same boundaries that are set in the local plan. The Borough Council has pressed the Parish Council to consider whether there needed to be changes to the settlement boundary to allow for future housing allocations. The neighbourhood plan has legitimately chosen not to make any residential site allocations and has decided to leave it to the Local Plan to identify such sites. I consider the consequences of changes to the village envelope will more appropriately follow on from the local plan site allocation process as premature changes in the envelope could pre-empt site identification and appraisal, which would be more sensibly carried out as part of the local plan making especially as the level of future housing requirements has not at this stage been set.

Recommendations

In the first sentence after “supported” insert “where it is in accordance with development plan policy and in particular”

In the first bullet, remove the text in parenthesis

Policy HOU2: Housing Mix

59. There is a typographical error in the first bullet point which I can correct.
60. The policy requires that where it is required, affordable housing should be delivered either on the application site or within the plan area. I note that the Borough Council did not raise concerns that the policy does not allow financial contributions to be accepted which could be spent outside the plan area. I consider that the position being taken by the Parish Council in this policy to be a reasonable position, which is offering a local dimension to the affordable housing policy.

Recommendation

In the first bullet point omit one of the “for”

Policy DES1: Design

61. Whilst the concept of sustainable development is clear and well understood and is spelt out in Chapter 2 of the NPPF, I have concerns that the requirement, as stated, that new development must be “sustainable” is likely to be difficult for a decision maker to be able to assess, without further guidance. The response of the Parish Council refers to proposals meeting the criteria set within the policy but that is not evident by the way the policy is drafted and is in any event superfluous as the policy expects the various requirements to be met.
62. Planning Practice Guidance states that neighbourhood plan policy should be drafted so as to be “clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with “sufficient

clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.” I do not consider the policy has given clear and unambiguous guidance as to what it is being considered to be “sustainable”. Some people could consider, for example, that it was setting expectations regarding the performance of materials or energy use. I propose that “and be sustainable” be removed from the policy.

63. I have no other concerns regarding the specifics of the policy which are clear and straightforward.

Recommendation

In the first sentence, delete “and be sustainable”

Policy DES2: Development in the Madeley Conservation Area

64. I have no comments to make on the policy except that the Parish Council has clarified in response to a question I raised in the Initial Comments that the Viewpoint B should be shown as being views taken from Station Road. I will recommend that the arrowheads on the bottom two arrows, which are shown adjacent to Station Road should be omitted.

Recommendation

Amend Map DES2 to remove the arrowheads closest to Station Road on the bottom 2 arrows showing View B

Policy CF1: Recreation, Leisure, Play and Sports Facilities

65. I have no comments to make in terms of the choice of the sites or the criteria to be applied if a proposal would result in the facility being lost.

Policy CF2: Community Infrastructure

66. A neighbourhood plan policy is required to be a policy for the development and use of land which can be used to determine a planning application. This policy is more of a statement of budgetary priorities offering guidance in terms of how infrastructure money is to be spent within the parish.

67. A planning obligation can only be sought where the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have been met which require contributions can only be sought where:

- It is directly related to development
- It is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and
- Is well related in scale and kind to the development.

68. Therefore, contributions can only be sought for specific projects that meets the three tests and in particular the obligation must specify what projects the funds are to be used for. Many Section 106 Agreements include provisions for contributions to have to be returned if they are not spent on that particular project within a specified period of time.

69. I have been advised that the Borough Council has not adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy Schedule which would allow for the collection of contributions from a range of development types across the plan area to be spent on

infrastructure. Where such a levy is applied and a neighbourhood plan is in place, the Parish Council receive 25% of that receipt to spend on its priorities. The Borough Council confirms that it relies upon Section 106 payments, which have to meet the above tests.

70. It is not appropriate for a neighbourhood plan policy to be setting out the priorities as to how funding is to be distributed to projects within the parish as it would not be a policy to be used for determining planning applications. It may well be that there is infrastructure funding made available, for example, from public funds, where it would be entirely appropriate for the Parish Council to identify where it wishes such money to be spent within the parish, but that should not be part of a neighbourhood plan policy but can be included within the supporting text of the plan. I will recommend that the proposed policy be deleted.

Recommendation

That the policy be deleted but the contents can be moved to the supporting text

Policy NE 1: Natural Environment

71. I have no comment to make on the policy except that there will be some planning applications where matters such as impact on the rural character of the area or impact on wildlife habitat, ecology and biodiversity, will not be relevant. I will therefore propose that the policy be caveated by “where appropriate”.

Recommendation

In the first sentence, after “Development must” insert “where appropriate”

Policy TRA 1: Critical Road Junctions

72. The use of the term “must” removes any flexibility on the part of decision-makers as to whether policy can be applied to a particular type of development. Some developments do not have transport implications. I will be proposing a form of wording that requires the triggering of the policy in instances where it is likely to have transport implications. The requirement for storage of mobility scooters is to be encouraged, but there will be some instances where a blanket requirement would be totally inappropriate, for example, a children’s play area.
73. I do consider that it is reasonable for new dwellings to include facilities for secure storage such as a garden shed, which could be used for bicycles, prams and buggies or if required mobility scooters, but there may be situations such as conversion of floorspace above shops into flats, where it may not be feasible to insist on such storage.

Recommendations

In the first paragraph replace “must” with “which is likely to create additional journeys will be expected to”

In the second paragraph, first sentence replace “must” with “will be encouraged to”

Policy CMV 1: Centre of Madeley Village Special Policy Area

74. Following the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) Order 2020, Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1 and D1 have now been subsumed within a new Class E. The uses which had fallen within Use Class A4 and A5 are now sui generis uses so do not fall into any use class but their inclusion is covered by the wording of uses in the policy, being uses suitable within a shopping area.
75. A policy should give certainty to decision maker as to how proposals which meet the requirements will be determined. It is not acceptable for a policy to be couched in terms of support by being “*considered* for approval”.

Recommendation

In the second paragraph, replace the existing text in parenthesis with “(including uses that fall within Use Class E)” and replace “considered for approval” with “approved”

The Referendum Area

76. If I am to recommend that the Plan progresses to its referendum stage, I am required to confirm whether the referendum should cover a larger area than the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. In this instance, I can confirm that the area of the Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan as designated by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council on 11th May 2017 is the appropriate area for the referendum to be held and the area for the referendum does not need to be extended.

Summary

77. I congratulate Madeley Parish Council on reaching this important stage in the preparation of this neighbourhood plan. It marks a milestone in the preparation of planning policies that have been prepared by the community which will be used by others to determine planning applications in the parish.
78. The plan has only focussed on the matters that are of importance to the local community. That is why neighbourhood plan making is different to the production of a Local Plan. It will, of course, be necessary to keep the plan under review to have regard to changes in the strategic planning context of the district.
79. To conclude, I can confirm that my overall conclusions are that the Plan, if amended in line with my recommendations, meets all the statutory requirements including the basic conditions test and that it is appropriate, if successful at referendum, that the Plan, as amended, be made.

80. I am therefore delighted to recommend to Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council that the Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan, as modified by my recommendations, should proceed, in due course, to referendum.

JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI
John Slater Planning Ltd
13th January 2022