

Comment ID number	Personal			Section based										Any other comments		
	Respondent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Position (if applicable)	Section 1: Introduction	Section 2: Vision & Objectives	Section 3: The Neighbourhood Plan & the Planning System	Section 4: Employment, Rural, Diversification & the Local Economy	Section 5: Settlement Boundary	Section 6: Community & Housing	Section 7: Housing Distribution	Section 8: Environment, Green Infrastructure, Open Space & the Countryside	Section 9: Planning Obligations & Local Infrastructure Priorities	Appendix 1			
1	Paul Deville														REQUEST FOR POTHOLES O BE FIXED IN ROADS, AND REMOVE 2 MINI ISLANDS.	
2	Dudley Taylor														This is a second response (no. 24). Thanks all members. Concern with site 6 on map 4, highlighting access issues. disappointed that call for sites procedures has not been followed as there is no submission on access or services provisions as required. Acces would be require third party consent. our view is that it is unsuitable for residential development.	
3	Graham Morrell			All comments relate to 5.9 Map 4 Site 6 - see below - please remove from plan				5.9 Map 4 Site 6. Remove Site 6 which is directly adjacent to our boundary from plan for following reasons: - There is no access, concerns about considerable traffic and noise issues - There is a blind corner at the junction of Cowley Lane and Wharf Road, bad enough now, but with increased traffic worried about safety - There are electricity pylons to rear of our property with lines crossing the proposed site at quite a low level which I think would cause problems for heavy goods vehicles accessing the site. Having realised what could be developed up to my boundary, feel this would force me to sell due to noise and being overlooked.								Remove Site 6 on Map 4 from the plan
4	Amanda Morrell			Disagrees with 60% of the housing development in Morks Walk area. 60 houses and would result in overdevelopment. 1.5 The new proposed Settlement Boundary area is already rural.	2.1 Proposal goes against vision and harms attractiveness, negatively impacts on village qualities and cannot see any benefits to immediate community. K02 Sustainable Development Strategy: Plan focuses only on Gnosall Heath, not Gnosall, and is disproportionate. K04 Environmental Protection: Does not safeguard and significantly decreases our health & wellbeing.	3.7 Extremely angry at lack of information to those affected and at short response time over Xmas period. Submit Sites - there is no access to site, impact on local traffic with 120+ cars, impact on village traffic, schools, doctors etc. Poor access and parking. 3.26 Numbers do not add up, nor do they justify the need for this major development. 3.32 Traffic policies T1 & T2 have not been considered, please provide proposals for access routes/ impact on local area during and post construction.	Policy: Rural Diversification - points (a) - (d) have not been considered in proposal?	Disagree for need for new settlement boundary. 5.2 What "employment and other uses" are proposed? "Spatial Principle" either side of the boundary - does this leave door open for yet more development? 5.5 Disproportionate scale and distribution of housing. 5.9 Map 4 Item 6: unfair to put the one and only "major site" in this location. Want to see more details of proposal. What happens if third party does not agree to development access? What is your back-up plan? Who owns the land and proposed access route?	Concerns of residents are not being listened to. Plan exceeds majority view of no more than 100 new homes. 240 new homes unjustified. Scale, density, character & amenity of village will be ruined forever. Site is on a hill, and would overlook our garden immediately adjacent to the boundary. Concerns about drainage, telegraph poles already crossing the land, etc.	Site is hilly, crossed by pylons, concerns about drainage run off. Highway and access issues. Landscape / visual impact will be negatively affected. Land has high ecological intensity and home to various wildlife and species. This plan further divides the two halves of the village by putting all development at far South East fringe creating an urban sprawl into the countryside.	8.1 Proposed area is a wildlife corridor, habitat and eco-system. 8.2 & 8.3 parishioner's views have been ignored. 8.5 Economic prosperity - We have hired numerous local tradesmen but will now be forced to move. Our health & wellbeing is severely at risk. 8.6 Connection of built area to countryside will be removed. What is the plan for the recreation area in Gnosall Heath - detailed proposal please? 8.10 why are agricultural fields not being protected like Audmore Loop?	9.2 Development not acceptable in scale. Policy 10 Open Countryside: Demolishes countryside, isolates rather than connects, strain on current access to village centre. Demolishes viewpoints and obliterates views.	Concerns re risk of cramming, loss of amenity and open space, standard palette of major build, impact on countryside	Our dream to escape to the country is now in tatters. We have spent thousands of pounds locally on improvements and everyday living and will now be forced to sell at a reduced price. Deeply disappointed and angry by this proposal and the underhand way it has been brought in with no announcement in Parish News or consultation with affected property owners.		
5	Michael Gough			(See detailed letter) - KO2 - Do not support new settlement boundary.	Suggest a mention of Audmore Loop in paragraph 3.21.			Questions what is meant by Spatial principles? Would only support for infl development for the boundary as it was on 31/12/2014. Support sites 2, 3 and 7 if arguments were fair and agreed by most residents then would support sites 4 and 5. Would need more consideration for sites 1 and 6.	Oppose the much needed affordable housing. Would prefer the word 'Maximum' included into paragraph 6.14 to append the housing numbers 230, and 20. Questions what is Non - Implementation Allowance.	Policy 7 - E - Concerns raised as current housing development provided by Bellway Homes have not fulfilled this policy and if Bellway have a set a legal precedent other house builders will just run a JCB digger through. 7.3 prefer the principle outlined in Option 1.		Do not support 'All weather sports pitch or skate park. GPC have already collected two unused / sapsreely used play structures.	This is confusing because maps do not seem the same as the larger ones used earlier and some areas previously highlighted are now omitted. Clarify please.	Thankful to the Working Group for ther effort and time put into preparing the plan. Found report hard to read, unhappy about the abbreviations used. On the major housing issues, applauds the report in its efforts to coalesce all factors together. It summarises housing in a polite policy statement; Policy 3 page 18, and expected a more aggressive summary.		
6	Alison Farmer							Objection to Site 6 - See detailed letter in Appendix xx. A number reasons for objecting to site 6 due to a significant strain on local infrastructure and services, increase in volume of traffic, congestion, safety issues, school buses experiencing problems on roads, increased level of pollution and noise. Affordable housing will attract young people and criminal activity. New access road will deprive young people of a safe play area. Development will compromise and destroy local atmosphere, local fauna and flora and disturb local habitats. Questions if need for local and affordable housing is a perceived or actual one?								
7	Beryl Whincup					3.21 The Acres, the former railway line and the Shropshire Union Canal should be protected as assets.		Agree with settlement boundary. The Cowley Quarry development does not affect people's direct access to the countryside or interfere with public footpaths. I agree that development should be on the basis of a minimum of 1.7 acres being made available for recreation, sports and a children's play area.	6.14 agree with housing provision set out in plan. I trust that a substantial proportion of these dwellings will be affordable housing for young people from the village and its surroundings - at least 50% on the 3 sites indicated in this section of the NP.	I agree fully with the conclusions put forward under the heading 'preferred option' in this section - paragraphs 7.4 7.5 7.6	8.10 - 8.13 I agree whole-heartedly that these areas form a vital part of our environment and need to be protected. This includes the Audmore Loop.			Having read carefully through the NP several times I commend the efforts of the working group in setting out the best way forward for development within the parish of Gnosall.		
8	Doug Webb			Introduction good but understandably lengthy.	Good	Necessarily long and involved. Para 3.23 - is a very true statement. Developers have produced extremely flawed traffic analysis documents. Traffic must not be ignored when making planning decisions. Stafford was grid locked yesterday (29/12/14) due to a couple of incidents on the M6, with the amount of proposed development in Stafford and the surrounding area this is likely to be a daily occurrence unless something is done to minimise the problem.	There is very little opportunity for employment in the village. Home working is an option.	The Settlement boundary should be as shown in Map 4, but with the exception of including Site 1. Land to the rear of Old Barn Close. More than enough development in this area already, outside the possibility of younger families in the village to afford one. Plus access to the proposed site is said to be via Old Barn Close itself. This should not be permitted as the access would be via a small green area used by the children to play.	Agree with housing provision set out in plan. Policy 7 Section L - Great in theory, but as already stated before walking / cycling to work out of the village is just a non-starter and use of public transport is an option but unreliable. Page 22 Para 7.3 - I'm not clear as to the definition of Option 1. Best option is Option 4. Para 7.4 - I am unclear as to if the preferred option includes the purple / light blue areas outlined in red.	I have no problem with this section other than if the village is to expand then facilities for leisure should be provided / extended. Intrusion into the countryside by development should not be allowed. Our surrounding countryside is precious and should be protected.	We need to be much smarter with this. As much of this money must be channelled into the village amenities as possible. A gym would be nice, a youth centre would minimise antisocial behaviour and the roads must be improved to satisfy the demands of an increasing population.	As stated earlier Option 4 is my preferred option. I perceive that the map shown in this section doesn't include the purple / light blue areas shown in map 4. This is confusing and must be made clearer.	Thanks to the working group for their prodigious effort in getting the plan to the stage it is at now. I will support the NP whatever the outcome of this consultation.			
9	Julie Ingle														Support proposals in general. Concerned about designation of Horseshoe as a recreational facility. Other than dog walkers, very few villages use this area. If this is to be recreational facility it should be developed and promoted as children's play area or a provision for sports facilities. If there is also an area put aside for parking, this could encourage more people to use surrounding footpaths mentioned in report. this is important bearing in mind new proposed development boundary includes Knightley Rd and Old Barn Close housing developments, thereby creating a greater need for useable, child recreational facilities in this part of village.	
10	Robin Grime			Accepted	Accept Key Objectives	Accept - but if all that happens is that those local plans are ignored and passed on appeal by the Government Inspectorate then why bother?	Accept	Map 4 - I note that the planning boundary has been extended to incorporate Little Hasty Bungalow and Stone Cottage and wish you to note my concern at this move. What are the implications?	No comment	7.4; 7.5; 7.6 - approve this option but would prefer the release of land identified in the charts as 4.5, 6 and 7 to the acceptance of the Richborough proposal at Audmore.	Accept	Accept	is Option 4 preferred? It isn't clear.	Consideration to the development of the site identified as 4 on page 16 should, I feel, be given. I think that it is desirable that a new village centre is developed between Gnosall and Gnosall Heath to unify the communities. I understand that the flood plane would present issues but could (probably) be engineered to provide an attractive feature around which mixed domestic and commercial development could be placed. I know it may not be popular - but that may include reallocation of the allotments.		
11	John Prendergast														May I suggest Weavers Hill Quarry, which is big and not very obtrusive and could be the foundation of a small hamlet when worked out. This would be quite sustainable as it is close to Newport. I also send a map of waterlogging at the Horseshoe. The land floods easily. Concerned about development leading onto Cowley lane. Wharf Road is very congested at times, since what is arguably the best shop in the village, attracts more cars than can reasonably be accommodated. Turning out from Cowley Lane is already difficult due to the bend in the road by Ginger Croft running Home, restricting the view. Cowley lane currently has large farm vehicles using it regularly, visiting Church Easton and farms en route. Turning right or left onto the 518 by the Royal Oak Public House will be difficult, some people choosing instead to travel along Mill Lane to access the above.	
12	Mrs Elizabeth Dale															
13	David Cilt							Request that Site 6 is removed from the proposed plan. This would cause significant impact on Gnosall Heath and destroy the character of the village. Disproportionate to the size of the village. This is currently good agricultural land housing a variety of wildlife. Travesty to lose large piece of countryside. Ideally there should be no more development but accept this should be in areas where there is less impact and infrastructure in place. Do not believe that Site 6 is most suitable proposal for development.								

14	D Shelrake & A Robotham			Balanced and pertinent	KO3 very important	3.13 Invitation to submit sites - We have concerns that there is no indication on the sites proposed whether these submissions are from land owners, particularly on agricultural land, or merely someone who is trying to balance the difference in housing numbers between Gnosall and Gnosall Heath. 3.29 Support for smaller bungalows and affordable housing, need for much more accessible public transport for landsite 6.	4.4 The point is well made that it is difficult for the housing plan to tackle employment	Map 2 and Map 3 is incorrect. They appear to show Quarry Nursery in the area which is designated Landsite 6. Quarry nursery is next to the quarry and outside the proposed and potential settlement sites. Map 4 and map 6 showing the potential sites state that Site 6 has been submitted on the basis of 1.7 acres being made over to a children's play area as well as recreation and sport. If so, consideration must be given to access and the proximity of Cowley Quarry and the potential danger of falls into the quarry itself. Consideration must be given to the potential for damage and noise that may be experienced by the residents of the dwellings cited above. There is now no direct access to Site 6.	6.12 No need for more than 100 homes. Site 6 Map 4 shows isolation of that area in relation to access to a road or public transport and should not be developed for housing. Site 6 does not comply with Policy 7a 7b 7k 7l and thus cannot feature under the designated good policy design due to no current access roads. Highlight future problems with traffic and access issues. Also the access field from Cowley Lane to Site 6 is under third party ownership. Has this been discussed with the owners?	7.2 We consider that any major engineering on the rock of Site 6 would possibly damage the integrity of The Quarry on our land as well as the rock face along the Cut south of the Tunnel of the Canal. 7.3 Option 3 - development focussed on Site 6 would be a major concern.	8.6 Green open space viz. The Acres is highly appropriate for Gnosall Village, but Gnosall Heath lacks play areas for younger children. It would seem appropriate to use the bottom end of Site 6 for such play areas, bearing in mind there is a slope so this would limit ball games.	We accept the discussions over planning obligations but would argue that Gnosall must be independent in its deliberations, without pressure from the Borough Council	We consider that Option 1 or Option 4 would be the most suitable, covering, as is suggested, both Gnosall Village and Gnosall Heath.			
15	Mr. Anthony Edward Griffiths							Map 4. Proposed settlement boundaries – 2015.I am in favour of the proposed settlement boundaries.					Policy 11 - Map 6. Environmental & potential sites. I am in favour of designating the "Audmore Loop" and the "Acres and allotments" as proposed areas of special protection.		My congratulations to Gnosall Parish Council for a job well done. I am in favour of this plan.	
16	Catherine Rosevear												A replacement pool would be more advantageous to the community than a new Grosvenor centre.	Object to any future plans to build behind Fountain Fold, Ginger Hill, Quarry Cottage.	A pool and gym wh rooms for community use would be more useful for all members of the community and provide employment. Thank you to the Working Group for their hard work and commitment of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	
17	Alan William Warren							I assume inclusion of land west of the Canal between the Navigation bridge and Cowley tunnel within the proposed boundary is to ensure its rural nature.					Accept Audmore Loop is attractive areas and under threat. Its community use though, is certainly historic and would be good for the open area to be used for local benefit i.e. community fetes.	A replacement for Grosvenor Centre is not necessary as village has a number of meeting places. The recreational facilities are required for people of all ages, there are no indoor facilities. A gym and swimming pool to replace the one recently lost would be most welcome.	Object to future proposals on Site 6 or anywhere that impacts on the Shropshire Union Canal in Gnosall Heath.	The Plan is well considered and I appreciate the effort and commitment that has been put into it.
18	Gail and Mike Gregory			This effectively sets the document in context in a clear and structured way.	Vison - Agree, KO1 - Agree with this, KO2 - Find this is essential to the plan to safeguard from ad-hoc development, KO3 - Agree and find this is excellent, KO4 - Find this essential to the plan, KO5 - Timely mention of this as we don't think we have had fair share up to this point.	Context has clear justification and reaffirms local people's concerns. Consider KSV housing figure to be high and suggest this is checked in comparison to completions and commitments data supplied in October 2014. Concerned why the Loop is not classified as heritage asset and therefore seek HA status? Concerns around the impact of traffic on narrow streets have been brushed aside	Highlight outward travel is a major consideration, changing the demographics by introducing younger families will increase this. Policy 1 is appropriate and necessary. Support towards continuation of rural and agricultural activity within and around Gnosall since it is what gives the village its distinctive character. Perhaps a statement to that effect could be included. Satisfied with Policy 2 where diversification is necessary but want farming to continue.	Support for infill or small scale development only. Site 1 - not to be included, Site 2 - support for infill development only, Site 3 - a useful infill site, Site 4 - Support for development, Site 5 - do not support inclusion of this site, Site 6 - do not support the inclusion of this site as not necessary, Site 7 - Support for this site. Pleased that land of A518 is not within Settlement Boundary as this is first class farming land which should be preserved or would otherwise cause great strain upon our infrastructure.	The type of housing recently built, as much as the location has caused such anger. Houses are not affordable by young families. With infill we can easily achieve 220+ and that surely is a tipping point in terms of existing homes? Para 6.14 - Agree. Policy 3 - "reserved 50-50 sites. Sorry - there are 4 highlighted with a red line? Could this be clarified or is it us? Policies 4, 5 & 6 all seem very reasonable.	7.3 - Unclear as to the exact definition of the Option 1 area? Does this option include the purple area and light blue areas shown in map 4 or not? Like the idea of no intrusion into open countryside. Options 2 & 4 are each inadequate because they limit development to either Gnosall or Gnosall Heath. In terms of natural justice, that is neither fair nor appropriate. Previous development has divided villages. Option 4 seems pragmatic and fair. Para 7.4 - unclear as to whether the preferred option includes the purple / light blue areas outlined in red.	There is an evident need to protect the leisure spaces we have, since we have little else to offer our young people, especially since the Pool, Library and YC are to close. Agree with designation of Audmore Loop but would opt for the highest possible protection ie inclusion within the heritage definition. Open countryside which surrounds Gnosall is an asset in itself and thus development which intrudes into it should be resisted.	We are in desperate need of something for young people to do - if we don't provide this, anti-social behaviour will flourish. In order to protect their environment, youngsters must feel that they have a stake in it i.e leisure facilities such as gym, pool. Thus Policy 14 is very much needed.	This is confusing because maps do not seem the same as the larger ones used earlier and some areas previously highlighted are now omitted. Clarify please.	I (GG) admire the tenacity of the group immensely. Congratulations and thanks to all.		
19	Peter Boland	English Heritage	Historic Places Advisor													Pleased to see an emphasis on the re-use of existing buildings and on sympathetic rural conversion and diversification to achieve future sustainable uses for farm buildings. In this regard we note that there appear to be a number of historic farmsteads within the Parish and we would draw your attention to the English Heritage guidance, the Staffordshire Historic Farmsteads Project, which was produced in conjunction with the County Council. We consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should include a policy requirement for applicants for planning permission affecting historic farmsteads to demonstrate that they have made positive use of this guidance in the preparation of their detailed development proposals.
20	Amanda Franklin			Clear but weighty.	Agree	Comprehensive. 3.22. I believe is a key issue and proves to be a delatortory. Generally concerned about the loss of the attractive countryside.	Little employment in Gnosall. Most employers do not facilitate homeworking and this would not be successful.	Have had more than the agree % rate of development in Gnosall. Site 1 on map 4 is outside settlement boundary. Acces via Old Barn Close is on my house deeds from 1973 as a childrens play area.	Any further developemnt will impact current residents, with increased traffic. The land is agricultural we need this for food. . All the wildlife will vanish.	Para 7.3 all residents in Old Barn Close will be detrimentally affected by access and proposal in general. 4 and 5 bed properties are not what people require. This type of development gives no flexibility.	Intrusion to agricultural land is vey unnecessary. Risk of increase in flooding in gardens. Any development would exacerbate this issue.	Money needs to be ploughed in here. Amenities for young people, sports and social accommodation for elderly and youth activities are needed.	I feel sites should be within the black settlement boundary not the red because these are secondary to the original agreements.	important to have the Neighbourhood Plan to address village issues. Thank you to everyone for protecting our concerns.		
21	LD Perks							Remove site 6 - it is good farming land, a play area would lead to anti-social behaviour, steep slope leads to flooding of gardens, access is unsuitable								
22	Mrs C Chillington Mr T Chillington							Remove site 6 - field slopes mean flooding will get worse and loss of farmland.								
23	Miss Jayne Turner							Remove site 6 - flooding already bad on this site. Lighting - extar light will disturb wildlife and would effect local residents - dangerous place for a play area.								
24	Mr Dudley Taylor			In agreement	In agreement	3.13 concern that the information on the sites has not been made publicly available. There has been no "further public consultation to gauge public opinion" as set out in the call for sites. Concerned that site 6 is included on false premise that it is poor quality agricultural land.	In agreement	5.9 site 4 is subject to flood risk. Site 6 is grade 2 agricultural land, including this site undermines the objections to SCC land at Stafford Road and Audmore Loop applications. Access to this land is poor and woul drequire major highway improvements.	6.23 Policy 7 Sites 6 is contrary to 7a, 7b, 7k, 7l. Residents of Cowley lane should be made fully aware of the proposals to access this site.	In agreement	In agreement	option 1 and 4 favoured. Option 3 not favoured due to total unsuitability of site 6	Excellent document, with the exception of site 6.			
25	Mike and Linda Sullivan			A good introduction covering the objective of the Plan.	We agree with the Visio set out. Suggest KO2 is refined to stop massive urbanisation that is not appropriate. KO3 To take local views into account is all that is requested.	Reaffirms local peoples aspirations. If development is to take place within the constraints of our plan then it is critical that new build homes ARE affordable. 3.27 The figure remaining for KSV quoted seems to be incorrect and needs updating. Audmore Loop should be listed for protection as a rural asset and thesis addressed in policy 11. 3.32	Agree with this and in particular Policy 1. Appropriate and small scale opportunity would be welcomed here for more employment to reduce number of cars and commuters travelling outwards for work.	Only infill and windfall growth would be required over the plan life as we already have so many permissions forced upon us it makes choosing future sites extremely difficult. My comments are -> Site 1 with acknowledged access issues is situated at the end of OBC, and does intrude into the open countryside, not in favour of further development here. Site 2 - Infill No objection Site 3 - Infill. No objection Site 4 - Infill. No objection Site 5 - small scale infill. No objection. Site 6 - larger scale. Not currently required for inclusion as existing numbers for Gnosall are already exceeded. Site 7 - Infill. No objection. We are aware that with massive initial opposition and subsequent Borough refusal that the land of the A518 does not feature within the proposed SB. This site is first class farming land which should be preserved. We feel the harm caused by constructing of new homes outweighs any benefits that housing of this scale would bring to our historic village.	The type of housing recently built, as much as the location has caused such anger. Houses are not affordable by young families. With infill we can easily achieve 220+ and that surely is a tipping point in terms of existing homes? Para 6.14 - Agree. Policy 3 - "reserved 50-50 sites. Sorry - there are 4 highlighted with a red line? Could this be clarified or is it us? Policies 4, 5 & 6 all seem very reasonable.	7.2 site 6 has limitations a) geological fault, b) no direct highway access, c)limited pedestrian access, d)landscape and visual impact, e) ecology and habitats. 7.3 option 3	There is an evident need to protect the leisure spaces we have, since we have little else to offer our young people, especially since the Pool, Library and YC are to close. Agree with designation of Audmore Loop but would opt for the highest possible protection ie inclusion within the heritage definition. Open countryside which surrounds Gnosall is an asset in itself and thus development which intrudes into it should be resisted.	With the loss of so many valued facilities in such a short space of time it is critical that funding is secured to replace them from any new development taking place. It is essential we use the CIL payments or S106 monies to give the youth and the elderly some new facilities that they now find themselves devoid of.	The work required and undertaken thus far to produce this document is tremendous and the village should be grateful to the NP Working group and Parish for striving to get it to this stage.			
26	Eiryl McCook	Highways Agency	Asset Manager													The Highways Agency (HA) is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England, which includes all motorways and major trunk roads. The SRN in the vicinity of Gnosall consists of the M6 motorway. At this stage the HA do not have any specific comments on the plan at this time. However, we would be grateful if you could consult us on subsequent stages as appropriate.

27	Mrs L. Thompson & Mr JDW Thompson			Well thought out and clearly expressed	In agreement	Being disabled I have not been able to visit the Parish Rooms. I have been to the Impstone Centre twice and found it closed and locked. Maybe given opening times would have been helpful. I have visited the online site and found it intimidating.	In agreement	5.8 Map 2 and 3 Cowley nursery and Cowley cottage belong to Quarry cottage and are not available as a potential site. 5.9 Concern for safety of children and the proposed paly area. Huge danger of canal and quarry. But agree there is a great need for play facilities in Gnosall Heath. Site 4 - Can remember seeing the allotments flooded and dogs having to swim. need to check for possibility of flooding in this area. Site 6 - Large field is designated as high grade agricultural land on map 7. Access is problematic. Cost of suitable road would be huge. The coloured site map shows access across Cowley Lane right to the canal- must be an error Cowley Lane is not suitable and slopes into canal. Conservation area boundaries also need to be checked before building on site 6.	6.23 Policy 7 Sites 6 is contrary to 7b, 7e, 7j, 7k	Site 6 is not supported. Instability of rock, historically known. Adjacent properties have had to carry out reconstructive garden work due to past flooding. If more houses were built this could get worse. Concern over loss of light. Concern of disruption to wildlife	In agreement	In agreement	Option 1 or 4	
28	Janet and John Dykes							Para 5.9 Item 5 Land off Back Lane is unsuitable for development for following reasons. Land floods very quickly in wet weather. Access is problematic as North Drive is private and permission is unlikely and access to Plardwick road would be dangerous. Access from this road and from Back Lane to the AS18 is very difficult. This land is lower than the surrounding land and the existing fall to the main sewer in Glendower Close is very shallow resulting in frequent blockages				Map 7 needs clarification i.e. What do grey lines represent? Policy 14 item (i) We do not agree that a new community centre should have priority over other additional facilities for the village		
29	Sue Knight				I particularly agree with the vision and objectives of the Plan.			I disagree with the proposal to build near Old Barn Close (Site 1). Extra housing here would extend the boundary limits and would have a significant impact on traffic on Moorend Lane. I note that the boundary at the bottom end of the loop would allow infill in the small triangular field. I think it would be better to include this field in the area of Special Protection. This would protect the rural views and 'entrance' to the Loop. I particularly agree with limiting the new Settlement Boundary so that it does not extend too far beyond the Residential Development Boundary		I particularly agree with the need to limit further large scale housing developments.	I particularly agree with the proposed areas of special protection			
30	Karen Reeves													Although not resident within Gnosall parish (I am in Church Eaton) I wish for the Council to be aware of the concerns of myself & other local residents regarding any increase in traffic through our narrow rural roads which will only get worse with further housing developments in Gnosall. SCC have no published plans to improve the infrastructure of the local rural roads & lanes which are already in very poor condition in some areas. Any increase in housing will have an effect on commuting routes for residents to reach the urban areas where most will work. It is naive to think that any future residents will only use the 'A' roads to get to where they need to be
31	Gren Knight				I found the Plan to be well evidenced, comprehensive and sensible. I particularly agree with the vision and objectives and the need to limit further large scale housing development.			Agree with the settlement boundary. I disagree with the proposal to allow development near Old Barn Close (site1), highlights traffic issues along narrow lane. Subject to landowner agreement, allow a permissive footpath alongside adjacent fields, to the gate which provides a delightful viewpoint for pedestrians. Line drawn that would allow significant development in the field above the quarry goes too far. As with my objection to site1, the proposal provides a hostage to fortune by extending the building line beyond the housing at the top of the adjacent road. A smaller area would be acceptable here.			Important to redraw the line of the protected area of the Loop so that it prevents development of the small field opposite our house.	I am not convinced the top priority for the village is a larger Parish centre. It seems to me that the Grosvenor Centre and the Village Hall are sufficient. It would be sensible if some community use could be built into the new school if more space is needed.		
32	Antony Deaves									I wholeheartedly support the plans preferred option for the development boundary as detailed at item 7.4 on page 23.	the small field opposite our house. This is not just a selfish objection.			The plan has addressed and achieved a balance between the need for more houses and the need to retain open spaces for recreational pursuits.
33	Sandra Webb				The planning system is fundamentally flawed and is totally biased towards the developers and no consideration is taken of the wishes and needs of the local community. The idea of a Neighbourhood Plan is a good one provided sufficient weight is given to it and the profit margin for developers doesn't influence the outcome.	The likelihood of employment in Gnosall is more or less nil. Even in Stafford employment opportunities are at a minimum. The likelihood of employment in Gnosall is more or less nil. Even in Stafford employment opportunities are at a minimum.	The settlement boundary should remain as shown within the black lines on map 4 (to include site 3). We have had more than our fair share of developments already and any more, other than infill, would be completely excessive.	The type of houses built so far DO NOT meet the needs of our existing growing population. Developers aren't interested in building starter homes, or smaller bungalows as they don't make enough profit from them. (Quote direct from a representative of Belway Homes at the farce of the initial public consultation meeting)	Option 1: development being accommodated within a newly defined Settlement Boundary, (The black line shown on map 4) with no additional strategic release of land outside it being necessary. Infill within the settlement boundary is sufficient.	Building houses here would mean that the rural entrance to the Loop would	Section 106 money (or CIL) must have no part in deciding whether to support an application or not. Section 106 money / CIL is seen as a bribe from the developer to get their application accepted. Negotiation over this money should only be entered into once an application has been accepted on pure planning considerations. Better effort must be made to secure the best possible deal for Gnosall as a whole and not just for the new residents on any particular estate.	Option 1 is my choice. We have taken more than enough new housing already.	A neighbourhood plan is a must. But, the plan must reflect the wants and wishes of the community as a whole, not what a select number of people think that the residents wish.	
34	Doreen Deaves								I have read the Neighbourhood Plan with interest and would like to support the preferred option as detailed in section 7. As there is very little employment opportunities in the Parish area then it follows as was found that there is a higher than average number of people commuting from the area.	become urbanised. Clearly that is inconsistent with the proposed protection				
35	Margaret Mirehull										for the area.	Map 6, P27 Strongly disagree to land in our ownership having any restriction placed on it. Do not support the designation of Special Protection. Request the removal of this designation.		
36	Sheila R Moulton											Map 6, P27 Strongly disagree to land in our ownership having any restriction placed on it. The field was part of Audmore Farm, i.e. agricultural land. Do not support the designation of Special Protection. Request the removal of this designation.		
37	Robert Steven Jobson							Several concerns: Inclusion of site 1 on map 4 within the settlement boundary implies some sort of acceptance of this as a development site; question whether it is necessary to include this in the Plan at all. No need for further housing that will encroach on the Countryside. Object to site 1 - drainage - is already problematic. Access - access into Old Barn close is beyond a dangerous bend, with speeding traffic. Similarly access into Moorend Lane is from a narrow winding road. Noise, pollution and overlooking Grade A Farmland should be protected.				Current infrastructure cannot support the village as it stands. Further development would exacerbate this problem. Our doctors, dentist and school already have capacity problems.	I feel we have been forced as a village to accept more than our fair share of development. Both low cost and affordable, as well as "upmarket". I see no need to alter the previous boundary apart from the sites which have already been accepted for development. In addition I would not be able to support a Plan which included site 1 in the boundary.	
38	J Lawbon							Object to site 6 construction will be noisy, should focus on refurbishing houses instead of building new ones, field is good quality farmland, wildlife will suffer, heavy machinery will endanger cats, fresh country air will be destroyed, will cause personal stress.						

62	Jane Merryn Adcock				agree with objectives and would emphasise the importance of varied, small scale developments.			Option 4 seems to be the only suitable plan likely to meet the needs of Gnosall residents and I think the Horse Shoe development should not be considered at all for all the reasons given by local people in surveys etc and the Monks Walk Development should be much smaller - because of it's agricultural value and because on the projected scale it would have the same problems experienced by Brookhouse. Option 4 - I don't agree with the statement that the opportunity to secure affordable housing is reduced by Option 4 - witness Lowfield Lane and the bungalows built recently at the top of Monks Walk.							If the Grosvenor Centre is to be upgraded why not build another small development/business centre on the site of the Village Hall which is currently underused and difficult to manage.
63	Ted Manders	Stafford Borough Council						Policy 4 – Affordable Housing in the Parish The Council does not consider it necessary to include this policy as it does not provide any locally specific approach but simply signposts to Policy C2 within the Plan for Stafford Borough. Policy 6 – Support for Creative and Innovative Infill development The Council would suggest that this policy could be strengthened to specify the type of development relevant and indicates where this type of development is best suited or encouraged. The Council suggest that additional wording (in italics) is inserted so that the policy reads, "The Parish Council will support infill development within the defined settlement boundary of Gnosall and Gnosall Heath" Policy 7 – Support for Good Design The Council would support reference to the Gnosall Conservation Area Appraisal 2013 to inform the design of developments adjacent to the Conservation Area taking account of character and setting.			Policy 8 – Enhancing, protecting and where possible increasing, open space and recreation provision The Council suggest that Policy 8 reflects what is identified on the Proposals Map and to replace the wording 'existing open space' to 'protected open space' to avoid confusion. Policy 9 Protecting and Enhancing Rights of Way -The Council suggest this should be clearly stated by adding the word 'All' at the start of the policy. Policy 10 – Open Countryside - The Council suggests further clarification, by way of a description, of what is meant by 'innovative and creative measures'. Policy 11 - Areas of Special Protection The Council consider that robust evidence, in line with paragraphs 76 & 77, is required to justify the areas identified on the Proposals Map, prior to submission of the final Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 12 – Pre-Application discussions The Council suggest this is re-worded so that it reads "Applicants and the Local Planning Authority are encouraged to engage with the Parish Council in respect of pre-application discussions" Policy 13 - Consultation on draft Planning Obligation terms The Council consider it is not appropriate to include this policy and would suggest this is deleted.				
64	Environment Agency	Environment Agency			Broadly in support of vision and objectives of the plan but request further considerations is given to flood risk, foul drainage and biodiversity issues.										See detailed responses for guidance and suggestions. FLOOD RISK - Site 4 is at risk of flooding in flood zone 3. Development should be steered in areas with low risk of flooding. This would comprise detailed hydraulic modelling of the Doley Brook which may in turn reduce the mapped flood extent and open up a larger proportion of the site for development. We therefore recommend that this site is withdrawn from the plan and alternatives outside the floodplain are considered in preference. You should also be aware that sites 5 and 7 may be at risk of surface water flooding. Overall, we consider that the risk of flooding within this locality should be given greater emphasis within the Neighbourhood Plan. FOUL DRAINAGE - The increased amount of waste water and sewage effluent produced by any new development will need to be dealt with to ensure that there is no detriment in the quality of the water courses receiving this extra volume of treated effluent. There must also be available capacity within the sewerage infrastructure (foul sewerage network and receiving sewage treatment works) in order to accommodate this flow before any development is occupied. Recommend Policy N2 of the Local Plan which states that all new development must provide adequate arrangements for the disposal of foul sewage, and surface water to prevent a risk of pollution is referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan. BIODIVERSITY - welcome any proposals to protect, enhance and improve the natural environment. Map 6 shows a number of environmental features which are considered important locally and are to be retained. Reference should be made to Policy N4 of the 3 Local Plan and consideration given as to how new development in Gnosall will comply with the specific requirements of the plan.
65	Geoffrey William Brown				3.27 As the figures show that we have achieved just under half the housing requirements for the 20 year period, why can't any further housing development be frozen until 2020? This would give the village a breathing space and accommodate the houses already built and planned. It seems to me this aspect of the PSFB has not been considered. 3.29 If the developers do not include sufficient bungalows in their plans, those plans should be rejected. It should be that the Council gets tough to achieve the sort of housing required, not what the developers want.		5.8 Regarding the new Settlement Boundary, it seems perverse that the square between the graveyard and submitted site 3 is not included. This is an ideal location for future development, be it housing or industrial units. Furthermore, having established housing along Lowfield Lane, it would be sensible to extend the Boundary to the old railway line with minimal impact on the surrounding area. 5.9 I object to any development behind Old Barn Close, site 1. This would be a disproportionate addition to the village boundary, intruding into the rural aspect in this area. Also, this end of the village is not suitable for the increase in traffic onto Audmore Road from such a development. What's more I shall object strongly if the access is through the Close itself. As this site is a good way from the bus routes it will inevitably lead to more traffic feeding into Audmore Road, an already congested road at peak times.	6.15 As stated in my comment for 3.27, why cannot the Balance to Plan figures be made up after 2020? This leaves 11 years to fulfil the 20 year requirement and takes pressure off development now.	7.6 I take it that this paragraph means that the Parish Council will resist strongly those applications that fall outside the new boundary. For example site 1.	8.13 The fact that the Audmore Loop is still outside the development boundary must lead to vigorous opposition from the Parish Council to any proposed development in this area. For the same reasons stated in this paragraph, I strongly object to this site even being considered.	Policy 11 I am very pleased to see that areas of open space will be brought into protected and special protected status. These are all too often taken for granted until a developer turns their attention to one and in no time it can be lost.				
66	Ann Margaret Sleightholme				3.15 Mentions East/West neighbouring towns but when it comes to the traffic on the lanes North/South for Stoke and Wolverhampton are also of concern. These routes for commuters will involve other places, Eccleshall and Church Eaton for example. It might be interesting to carry out a survey so see what proportion of the population presently commutes outside the village and which routes they take.	Map 4. I am sad that the field located between the medical centre and Quarry Cottage has been included – something of a carbuncle! I realise this is just being realistic as planning permission has already been granted there.					Policy 14 i. A new community centre to replace the Grosvenor Centre. Is that really necessary? Making more use of the land behind for sports facilities yes but the building is OK isn't it?	I am afraid I am confused by the options – my failure not yours. I need something like a 'Which? best buy' table with ticks in appropriate places. Our fair share of new build as a KSV with a variety of housing types and particular emphasis on infill rather than whole fields being built on would be my wish. I would like to see the school playing field a protected open space for future generations at the school though not to the detriment of the new school build.	Light pollution. I am shocked that driving up the Knightley Road at night the surgery has "security" lighting all night (I think) and the Bellway show house certainly still floodlit at midnight. I would like some limit on lighting generally. Some signs are now lit on premises on the A518, this takes away from the village atmosphere in my view. With the loss of the swimming pool and the much reduced size of the proposed new school when compared to the existing school the village appears to be losing amenities at a time of increasing in size. I think that the committee has done an excellent job in producing the Neighbourhood plan. I would like to think planning permission could not be granted outside areas defined that shown in black (and, reluctantly, red) on Map 7.		
67	M and R Booth			Clear and concise introduction and explanation of process.	Agree and support key objectives.	3.27 Figure (667) needs reducing to take account of recent approvals. 3.29 Although preference shown for bungalows, developers do not favour building them these days as land is so valuable. Two-storey maisonettes may be preferable, where elderly/disabled can have ground floor. People have had bungalows on the market in Gnosall for lengthy periods without selling. 3.30 States 'No further policies needed': What about Hollies 'Common' and Broadhill? See response to Section 8. 3.32 No mention of numerous narrow lanes in poor condition and some being used as 'rat runs'.	4.2 Surprised at employment sectors as shown by Census results. Would have expected more professional, qualified people to be resident here. 4.4 Small business units are needed in the Parish. What about the former Bayliss site at Knightley? 4.9 We support the need for more tourist accommodation including self-catering. There is a shortfall in the Parish. 4.9 We support the need for more tourist accommodation including self-catering. There is a shortfall in the Parish.	Division between Gnosall and Gnosall Heath not helpful to cohesiveness. In effect Map 4 shows two Settlement Boundaries. We suggest that there should be just one, with the two parts shown as joined. The allotments could be included, in the same way as the school playing fields are. This is a settlement, not a residential, boundary and as stated in paragraph 5.6 should include recreational areas. We suggest that Sites 1 and 6 should not be included in the Settlement Boundary. Sites 4 and 5 are within the flood plain and either completely or in part unsuitable for development. Infill and windfall sites are all that are necessary.	6.8 There is a large number of vacant homes in the Parish, as recorded by Stafford Borough Council recently (about 50). Policy 3: We are not in favour of the 2nd paragraph inclusion of sites at Old Barn Close and Site 6 on Map 6. Site 4 is difficult. These sites are not within proposed settlement boundary except for Site 4. We support the suggested figures of 230 homes and 20 in rural areas. The title of Map 4 appears to be misleading and would be better changed to match the captions. We support Policies 5, 6 and 7. We suggest that the land opposite the Navigation pub off A518 is set aside for public access to the canal, including car parking. There may even be room here for a play area.	Support Option 1.	Agree. What about other sites within the Parish similar to Audmore Horseshoe that have no protection, such as Hollies 'Common' and Broadhill? These are no longer registered commons and would benefit from also being given Protected Open Space Status, if that is possible within the Neighbourhood Plan. Map 6 is confusing. Paragraph 7.4 clarifies it. It would be better if potential development sites were not be shown on this map.	Support. Policy 14: We suggest a change regarding the word 'replace', with instead 'modernise and improve' the Grosvenor Centre. We are not in favour of demolition of old school building, although later additions would benefit from modernisation. Support Option One.	We commend the efforts of the Neighbourhood Plan Group. However, more clarity is needed re the maps in the next document. Map 6 is misleading. We suggest that sites without access would be better left out at this stage. Decisions regarding the sites at appeal (SCC Stafford Road) and under consideration (Audmore Horseshoe) may lead to the number of homes required being exceeded.		

68	Peter Collier			Para. 1.5 agrees with sites already permitted for inclusion to proposed Settlement Boundary. Disagree to include proposed new sites as they have not passed any test and no justification. Suggests suitability of each site needs to be tested and considered based on limiting development outside of the existing settlement boundary	2.1 Housing Provision "in line with local expressed preferences" There is no clear detail in the document to show expressed preferences have been followed.	3.13 Why have additional potential sites for housing drawn out by the 'Submit Sites' process been taken into account when preparing the proposed Settlement Boundary? Submission of a site does not make it sustainable or appropriate. 3.32 Amongst other considerations, the impact of traffic on local narrow roads, not the A518, should be assessed before a new site is put forward to be included in the proposed Settlement Boundary.	4.2 Although not a significant employer, agriculture is an important business to Gnosall. Too important to take land out of agriculture for ever just because it is a "Submitted Site". Population increase during the life of the neighbourhood plan will need food as well as housing. Food production needs to be sustainable, secure and local.	5.9 The proposed inclusion of Site 1 Map 4 would be an unwarranted intrusion into open countryside. The proposed site is a significant distance from existing public views. Para 6.1 "One strong message from the consultation survey is that many people in the village feel that Gnosall does not need additional housing". Para 3.29 "a majority view (59%) for no more than 100 new homes". The parish council web site states that 12 shared ownership scheme houses in Lowfield Lane are still available - newly built and never inhabited, these should count towards the proposed housing allocation. It also indicates limited demand for new houses in Gnosall. Policy 7. - I can only speak for Site 1 - land behind Old Barn Close which does not comply with Policy 7. a, b, c, d, e, g, j, k, and l. So why is Site 1 proposed?	6.14 I can't see Three sites (Reserve 50:50 Sites) on the plan on page 27? 6.15 A proposed housing allocation of 230 despite public views. Para 6.1 "One strong message from the consultation survey is that many people in the village feel that Gnosall does not need additional housing". Para 3.29 "a majority view (59%) for no more than 100 new homes". The parish council web site states that 12 shared ownership scheme houses in Lowfield Lane are still available - newly built and never inhabited, these should count towards the proposed housing allocation. It also indicates limited demand for new houses in Gnosall. Policy 7. - I can only speak for Site 1 - land behind Old Barn Close which does not comply with Policy 7. a, b, c, d, e, g, j, k, and l. So why is Site 1 proposed?	7.4 A compromise solution was considered the best way forward? Why? Without any consultation with the residents of Gnosall? The compromise is the worst of all the options quoted.	8.3 The views from the footpaths are every bit as important as the Horse Shoe. Adopting site 1 would destroy the enjoyment of the footpaths leading out of Gnosall and turn a pleasant rural area into urban Gnosall. 8.5 Do the small areas of land, cared for by the council, within residential areas need to be identified individually for their own protection within the life of the plan? Policy 8. A recreation activity like swimming would be all the more valuable with the proposed population increase and would save countless journeys to facilities in Newport or Stafford.	Policy 10. Protection and enhancement of the intrinsic value of the countryside around Gnosall and Gnosall Heath does not appear to be a feature of this draft document!			
69	G & H Beadmore														Support the plan and policies 1 to 14. NP reflects the wishes of the majority of the community who wish to see Gnosall remain a village, whilst recognising the needs of different age groups. Prefer option 1 with no further development outside the new boundary. Policy 3 ref map page 27 is meant to show 3 sites of preferred development can only see 2. Policy 7 enforcing this policy is a concern as trees and hedges destroyed in development are not easily replaced. Would any development of a new community centre be on existing site. Key objectives are not cross referenced clearly enough in the rest of document. Should the local survey results that formed the basis of the plan not be an Appendix?
70	Patricia Ann Tweed		Comprehensive introduction	Key Objectives agreed	No Comments	Para. 4 Increased opportunities for employment are essential. Small units to rent as office or workshop space may be a good use for retail premises which prove difficult to operate profitably, as has already happened in the High St. Slightly larger units could be established in disused agricultural premises on the outskirts of the village.	I support the allocation of a new Settlement Boundary to remain in force for the 20 years of the Plan.	The figures for housing development are sensible and appropriate for the village. The types of property should fit in with the needs expressed in the Survey and in line with the policies detailed here.	Two of the areas submitted for development seem very problematic. Para. 5.9 Area No.4 (behind the Romping Cat) appears to be on the edge of the flood plain. Area no. 6 would have considerable access problems for traffic and I understand there are geological concerns. The area behind Old Barn Close would have to lead into the existing road, as Moor End Lane is far too narrow and dangerous.	Flooding and drainage are serious concerns in Gnosall as shown by current problems with the water level on the Acres. More building especially over large areas will make matters worse. It makes sense to offer positive protection to areas identified on Map 6. I would support this.	The need for new infrastructure is evident already, with the loss of the library and youth club, as well as the large school hall. CIL monies should not be used for flood defences where the problem has been caused by inappropriate building. Page 30 The Grosvenor site could provide many facilities, but its position on the High Street presents serious traffic issues.	Option 4 would seem to provide the preferred option. Why would affordable housing be difficult to achieve? Is this due to the size of sites?	The Survey did not support release of land for employment opportunities, but it is essential to the future life of the village to prevent it from becoming a dormitory or a retirement settlement		
71	Derek Peter Tweed		Comprehensive introduction	Key Objectives agreed	No Comments	Para. 4 Increased opportunities for employment are essential. Small units to rent as office or workshop space may be a good use for retail premises which prove difficult to operate profitably, as has already happened in the High St. Slightly larger units could be established in disused agricultural premises on the outskirts of the village.	I support the allocation of a new Settlement Boundary to remain in force for the 20 years of the Plan.	The figures for housing development are sensible and appropriate for the village. The types of property should fit in with the needs expressed in the Survey and in line with the policies detailed here.	Two of the areas submitted for development seem very problematic. Para. 5.9 Area No.4 (behind the Romping Cat) appears to be on the edge of the flood plain. Area no. 6 would have considerable access problems for traffic and I understand there are geological concerns. The area behind Old Barn Close would have to lead into the existing road, as Moor End Lane is far too narrow and dangerous.	Flooding and drainage are serious concerns in Gnosall as shown by current problems with the water level on the Acres. More building especially over large areas will make matters worse. It makes sense to offer positive protection to areas identified on Map 6. I would support this.	The need for new infrastructure is evident already, with the loss of the library and youth club, as well as the large school hall. CIL monies should not be used for flood defences where the problem has been caused by inappropriate building. Page 30 The Grosvenor site could provide many facilities, but its position on the High Street presents serious traffic issues.	Option 4 would seem to provide the preferred option. Why would affordable housing be difficult to achieve? Is this due to the size of sites?	The Survey did not support release of land for employment opportunities, but it is essential to the future life of the village to prevent it from becoming a dormitory or a retirement settlement		
72	Matthew Thomas Braun				Para 3.32 - Whilst I agree that this document cannot address the overall traffic concerns, I do not feel that the document as a whole takes sufficient notice of this as an issue. New properties above several cars and children live at home longer (also with cars) An increase in houses in Gnosall will result in much higher traffic levels. Traffic must be considered - potentially using modeling.	The draft plan recognises the lack of employment opportunity within the village, and that there is little desire in the community for release of land for business development. People living in Gnosall will commute putting increased strain on the transport network within and around the village. Policy 2(d) this same principle can surely be applied in consideration of housing in Sections 5 and 6 below.	Para 5.8 - What is the significance of the inclusion of the two purple sites in the SHLAA? It is not explained what this means, or why these sites are included over and above the land submitted to the Parish Council's "Call For Sites". Maps - The boundary should be as shown in Map 4, but without Site 1, land to the rear of Old Barn Close. There are significant issues with development of this land, including access issues, drainage, the loss of play area and additional traffic disruption to the cul-de-sac of Old Barn Close itself.	Para 6.14 - It is not clear how the Neighbourhood Plan has come to the figure of 230 new dwellings for Gnosall village and 20 in the rural area. Please could someone provide a figure for the number of infill developments which have taken place within the village over the 20 years between 1991 and 2011 - is it more than 30? Would there be any reason to expect that the 30 property shortfall could not be met by infill? What is the definition of "commitments" in this context?	Para 7.3 - The "Settlement Boundary" shown in the maps in Appendix 1 does not include Lot 1 marked in purple in Map 4 in section 5, which is good. In which case, why is Lot 1 included in Map 4 in Section 5 at all? In Option 4, does the inclusion of the phrase "allowing for the release of additional small scale housing sites... outside the Settlement Boundary" imply additional development over and above that identified in Section 6?	Further extension of building into the surrounding countryside should not be allowed, in order to protect this environment.	It is not clear why Audmore Loop is designated for "special protection". Care to explain yourselves?	As stated in my response to Section 7, the document needs to be clear on the status of Lot 1 - it appears in Maps 4 and 6, but not in the maps in Appendix 1. Option 4 would appear to be the most suitable, given that some development is inevitable.	Concerned about "Lot 1" on Map 4 - Land to the rear of Old Barn Close. This appears on some maps but not on others, and its status of "included in SHLCC 2013" but not part of the "Call for Sites" is not made clear. Development of this site would have significant impact on local residents: Lack of suitable access, surface water flooding issues, loss of designated play area, flooding in gardens, privacy intrusions, removing green space, increased noise pollution. Suggest reference to Lot 1 and all maps should use the Settlement Boundary as set out in the maps in Appendix 1. This allows for some development without extending the village boundaries any more than necessary. I do not need to allocate land completely at this stage up to the estimated total, as expected infill development will fill in the shortfall over the next 20 years, as it has in the previous 20 years.		
73	Amanda Jane Halliday				The increase in traffic as a result of extra development is a worry. The amount of traffic in the village and on the roads into Stafford and Newport already causes long delays, especially during the morning and evening rush hours. Extra houses will only make this problem worse, especially as most households these days have at least 2 cars	The draft plan recognises the lack of employment opportunity within the village so people will have to commute for work. More people means more traffic on an already overstretched highway network	Para 5.8 - What is the significance of the inclusion of the two purple sites in the SHLAA and why have they been included? Why has the land south of Stafford Road not been included as there is proposed development here? Surely it should be indicated on the map in some way? Maps - The boundary should be as shown in Map 4, but without Site 1, land to the rear of Old Barn Close. There are serious issues with the development of this land, this site would have a significant negative impact on the residents: Drainage, flooding, insufficient access, loss of play area, privacy, high quality agricultural land, noise pollution.	Could you clarify how the figure of 230 houses has been arrived at?	Para 7.3 - The "Settlement Boundary" shown in the maps in Appendix 1 does not include Lot 1 marked in purple in Map 4 in section 5, which is good. In which case, why is Lot 1 included in Map 4 in Section 5 at all?	Further extension of building into the surrounding countryside should not be allowed, in order to protect this environment.	Could you clarify why Audmore Loop is designated for "special protection"? Ideally I would not want development here, but it seems to me it has better access than Old Barn Close and is already within the village boundary and surrounded by current dwellings. If we have no option but to accept some building, why not here?	Option 4 would appear to be the most suitable, given that we will have to accept some development.	My main concern is the ambiguity concerning the area designated as "Lot 1" on Map 4 - Land to the rear of Old Barn Close. This appears on some maps but not on others, and its status of "included in SHLCC 2013" but not part of the "Call for Sites" is not made clear. The final neighbourhood plan should remove reference to Lot 1 and all maps should use the Settlement Boundary as set out in the maps in Appendix 1. This allows for some development without extending the village boundaries any more than necessary. I would not be able to support the Neighbourhood Plan which included the land to the rear of Old Barn Close, but would be happy to support the Plan if that were removed.		
74	Margaret Maria Braun				Para 3.32 - I do not feel that the document as a whole takes sufficient notice of the overall traffic concerns. A high proportion of the development will have at least one, frequently two and sometimes three or more cars. An increase in houses in Gnosall will result in much higher traffic levels within the village and on the main roads into Stafford, Newport and the narrow moored lane on the way to employment centres. The Neighbourhood Plan needs to recognise the traffic impact, and would benefit from the inclusion of some analysis on potential increase in traffic.	The draft plan recognises the lack of employment opportunity within the village, and that there is little desire in the community for release of land for business development. People living in Gnosall will commute putting increased strain on the transport network within and around the village. Policy 2(d) this same principle can surely be applied in consideration of housing in Sections 5 and 6 below.	This section is ambiguous in its explanation of the maps, and yet is one of the most crucial parts of the document, "Lot 1" on Map 4 - Land to the rear of Old Barn Close. This appears on some maps but not on others, and its status of "included in SHLCC 2013" but not part of the "Call for Sites" is not made clear. This site would suffer a significant deterioration in our local environment should development take place on that land. Mainly: access issues, surface water, prime agricultural land.	Could you clarify how the figure of 230 houses has been arrived at?	Para 7.3 - The "Settlement Boundary" shown in the maps in Appendix 1 does not include Lot 1 marked in purple in Map 4 in section 5, which is good. In which case, why is Lot 1 included in Map 4 in Section 5 at all?	Further extension of building into the surrounding countryside should not be allowed, in order to protect this environment. Access to Lot 1 via Old Barn Close would involve the loss of a designated play area, where my children played over many years and the younger generations within the community are now playing. Given the spiralling rise in childhood obesity which is high on the public health agenda all designated play areas should be preserved.	It is not made clear why Audmore Loop is designated for "special protection".	As stated in my response to Section 7, the document needs to be clear on the status of Lot 1 - it appears in Maps 4 and 6, but not in the maps in Appendix 1. Option 4 would appear to be the most suitable, given that some development is inevitable.	I feel there is no need to alter the previous boundary apart from the sites which have already been accepted for development. Therefore I would not be able to support the Neighbourhood Plan which included the land to the rear of Old Barn Close, but would be happy to support the Plan if that were removed.		
75	Alistair Arthur					5.9 (Map 4 section 6) 4.5 hectares a developer is likely to put 120 dwellings in that acreage. This is a site at the furthest point from the local amenities and at the highest point in the village. The questionnaire report identifies bungalow style housing as being a key requirement, this, the largest site in the plan, is not a good choice for this. The area has a bridal path, quarry and canal side all assets to the village which will be blighted by such development. (Map 4 section 4 and section 5) Both section 5 and 6 are in areas that add character/ green space to the village. Both are in areas that flood	Policy 3 Housing Provision: Disagree with the Policy and the preferred sites for housing. Does not specify bungalows or retirement housing. Building has already started on Lowfield Lane, why not continue from there.	Page 22 (Less flexible infrastructure) Highway access. The Quarry Lane proposal would require a road project just to access the site.	8.8 Bridleways etc are an essential leisure and recreational function yet the plan proposes to build alongside Quarry Lane changing its nature and maybe even use as an access road.	Why is the First City Limited proposal not on any of the options considered?	Looks like the whole plan has been written to prevent the current planning proposals going ahead by moving the problem to land that is less suitable. What happened to the Most House Farm (SCC land) plan. This would be one development fulfilling the requirement for all future planning needs which is close to the village amenities. From which the village is more likely to get funding for village projects. Also the money from the sale of the land would go to the SCC from which we all benefit either directly or indirectly. The plan appears to ignore all the current development proposals. The Plan needs to take the current proposals into account. It would appear to be written to move the developments from the current proposals to different areas that are even less appropriate. Would it not be better to work with the SCC rather than against it and take current proposals into account and use this as a basis for the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan rather than adding additional land up for development?				

76	Howard Noel Halliday					Para 3.32 – An increase in houses in Gnosall will result in much higher traffic levels within the village and on the main roads into Stafford, Newport and other employment centres. The Neighbourhood Plan it must take the traffic impact into account, and would benefit from the inclusion of some analysis on potential increase in traffic.	The draft plan recognises the lack of employment opportunity within the village, and that there is little desire in the community for release of land for business development. Policy 2(d) would appear to support this in recognising that expansion of economic activities should be supported where this "would not lead to an increase in traffic levels beyond the capacity of the surrounding local highway network" – this same principle can surely be applied in consideration of housing in Sections 5 and 6 below.	Section ambiguous in its explanation of the maps. Para 5.8 – what is the significance of the inclusion of the two purple sites in the SHLAA. Maps – The boundary should be as shown in Map 4, but without Site 1, land to the rear of Old Barn Close. There are significant issues with development of this land, including access issues, drainage, the loss of play area and additional traffic disruption to the cul-de-sac of Old Barn Close itself. I have commented further in the "additional comments" section later in this document. There is no indication on Map 4, or in Map 6 in Section 9, that the land South of Stafford Road is currently subject to a Planning Appeal, which understand is due to take place in February. If that appeal is successful, this would mean another 150 houses, which would more than fulfil the total set out in Section 5.	Para 6.14 – Unclear how the Neighbourhood Plan has come to the figure of 230 new dwellings for Gnosall village and 20 in the rural area. Isn't this what Table 1 is saying? Provision required is 241, commitments and completions are 211, leaving a shortfall of 30, which could probably be achieved through infill, in line with Policy 6. Please could someone provide a figure for the number of infill developments which have taken place within the village over the 20 years between 1991 and 2011 – is it more than 30? Would there be any reason to expect that the 30 property shortfall could not be met by infill? What is the definition of "commitments" in this context?	Para 7.3 – The "Settlement Boundary" shown in the maps in Appendix 1 does not include Lot 1 marked in purple in Map 4 in section 5, which is good. In which case, why is Lot 1 included in Map 4 in Section 5 at all? The authors have "shown their working" here, which is useful, but there seems no merit in Options 2 or 3 – as defined within the document, "Gnosall" consists of Gnosall and Gnosall Heath, so focusing the development on one or the other would not seem to be a good idea – better to spread development throughout the village. Why would Option 1 in particular have "little opportunity to secure affordable housing" or "limited yield of S-106 benefits" compared to the other Options?	This section recognises the importance of the environmental quality of the village and surrounds, and the concerns of residents about the impact on that environment of any development. Further extension of building into the surrounding countryside should not be allowed, in order to protect this environment.	It is not clear why Audmore Loop is designated for "special protection". As described in the response to Section 5 above, Map 6 should also show the land to the south of Stafford Road as "Under Appeal". Would it be possible to give some indication of the likely value of S-106 or CIL in relation to the proposed development? Although Policies 13 and 14 indicate how the Parish would like to use the lands, it would be helpful to get an indication of how realistic the prioritised developments set out in Policy 14 are	Concerns about "Lot 1" on Map 4 – Land to the rear of Old Barn Close. This appears on some maps but not on others, and its status of "included in SHLCC 2013" but not part of the "Call for Sites" is not made clear. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The access points identified are either through Old Barn Close or Moorend Lane. Neither is suitable. Old Barn Close is a cul-de-sac, and the inclusion of an additional 20 properties would result in a significant amount of additional through traffic; and Moorend Lane is a narrow road with blind bends, where vehicles have difficulty in passing (particularly when large vehicles are involved). The area of Moorend Lane opposite the junction with Old Barn Close carries a great deal of surface water following rain, and is highly dangerous when icy. And visibility at the junction is poor. Turning from Old Barn Close onto Moorend Lane is already a dangerous activity, and there is a high risk of accidents, which would increase significantly with the additional traffic which would be generated by development of Lot 1 (whichever traffic access was selected). Access to Lot 1 via Old Barn Close would involve the loss of a designated play area, where my and my neighbours' children played over many years. The back gardens of the properties in Old Barn Close are already prone to a degree of waterlogging, and this would be exacerbated by additional properties at an elevated level. The building of 20 houses on land overlooking our gardens would be an intrusion into our privacy. <p>A development of 20 homes on Lot 1 does not meet that criterion. Suggests to remove reference to Lot 1 from the plan and all maps should use the Settlement Boundary as set out in the maps in Appendix 1. There should be</p>		
77	Will Mockett					In that time we have witnessed a steady increase in road traffic up Audmore Road, and as I work at Seighford I know from first hand experience the level of traffic along Moorend Lane. What with the Milk wagons, traffic is fast and furious, and erosion of the lane is certainly taking place at the village boundary point. We will have to wait until the children are older before we trust them to walk themselves to school with this fast traffic During the morning rush. Any further developments in the village will only put further strain on this lane, as folk use it to head North out of the village. The idea of an additional clump of homes at the back of Barn Owl Close would have a detrimental impact, and I'm glad to see that proposal isn't endorsed in the proposed Plan.	Sorry to see the extension to the boundary at the back of the surgery, I thought the existing boundary prevented the application of homes there.					I generally approve of all aspects of the proposed Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety. It is balanced and measured in its view of the development of the village, and I should like to acknowledge all the effort that all parties have put in into its deliverance. I should love to see two tennis courts applied for on the recreational patch of land next to the surgery. This would provide a business opportunity for those sporting folk amongst us, for the increasing number of kids in the village, who are about to lose the youth centre here I believe. A recreational centre for old folk to get exercise with all the associated health benefits. I propose it be sited below the existing school car park. Support for greater sporting/recreation facilities in the village. Support for the Neighbourhood Plan.			
78	Ralph and Pat Beaman														My wife and I have read through your proposed Neighbourhood Plan, and wish to give it our support. Our only concern is that the proposed homes behind the surgery towards Hollies Common, will only increase what is already heavy traffic use along the Brookhouse Road. Our grandchildren live up Audmore Road and it's hardly safe for them to cross the roads to school in the village.
79	Norman Hales														Village has already taken its fair share of additional housing. Irresponsible to destroy productive land for food. Sensible to build houses close to employment to reduce travel - there is little employment in Gnosall and residents will commute. These developments will generate an increase in traffic movements. There is a need to reconsider site 6 due to it being located on productive land, it is also adjacent to a quarry (there was an earth tremor in the area here once)
80	Thomas Edward Halliday														I was born in Gnosall, and have lived here all my life. Gnosall must not be spoiled by development. I have lived all my life in one of the houses that would be next to this land, and development would spoil the environment, as well as losing some good farmland. If access to Lot 1 was along Old Barn Close it would mean a lot more traffic and the loss of the play area where I spent many hours playing cricket and football with my friends. I cannot support the Neighbourhood Plan with Lot 1 included.
81	Joseph Aaron Halliday						There are few employment opportunities in the village – people like me have to commute to other towns such as Stafford (to catch a train to Birmingham).								Gnosall is a lovely village, which I have lived in all my life. It should not be spoiled, and additional development would risk that happening. Others, like me, should have the chance to grow up in this attractive rural environment. I have grown up in Old Barn Close, and the land to the rear (Lot 1 on Map 4) should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. Development there would spoil Old Barn Close, with a lot more traffic. One of the options for access to the new houses would be along Old Barn Close, and we would lose the play area at the end. I spent many hours playing football and cricket there while growing up, and other children should have the chance to do that in the future. The alternative access along Moorend Lane would be very dangerous – the road is narrow and visibility is very bad. I cannot support the Neighbourhood Plan with Lot 1 included.
82	Sarah Mockett														I write to express my support of the Draft Plan. Those members who have compiled the draft appear to understand the general view that as a village we have already gone some way to meeting the County's allocation of new homes, and that the draft is reasonable and responsible.
83	Malcolm Price							RDB (page 16). • The land to the south of Knightley Road, at the rear of the Doctor's Surgery should not be included in the enlarged RDB. A recent planning application to build 55 houses on this was rejected by Stafford Borough Council. • The graveyard and parcel of land to the south east should not be included in the enlarged RDB, unless it is protected by special measures to retain it for its intended purpose. • The area to the south west of the Shropshire Union Canal should not be included in the extended RDB. The canal should serve as a natural boundary. • The extension of the boundary to incorporate sites numbered 1, 4, 5 and 6 should not take effect unless these sites are finally approved to be included in the NP. With reference to the "Sites numbered 1 to 7" highlighted on the map on page 16 of the document I make the following comments. • Site No. 1 Access to this site is a concern with increased traffic flows onto Audmore Road. With continuous parking along this road it is virtually a single carriageway. • Site No. 2 Useful, but limited infill development. • Site No. 3 Useful, but limited infill development. Concern about access onto Stafford Road. • Site No. 4 Access to this site is unclear from the description of the site. The site falls within the flood plain as indicated on page 22 of the document, therefore is unsuitable.						I would support Option No. 4 as outlined in the Appendix 1. I wish to express my gratitude for the time and effort put in by all those involved in creating the draft neighbourhood plan for consultation.	

84	Paul and Gill Green							We would like to comment on the proposed plans for site 6, the 4.5 hectare site between Cowley Tunnel and bounded by Monks Walk, Far Ridding and Near Ridding and Fountain Fold. Agree that there is a need for housing development but do have concerns about this site as follows: 1) the use of what is described in the plans as "Very good" agricultural land when there are other sites that are only rated good to moderate. 2) Under Policy 2 - Rural Diversification 1. (d) would not lead to an increase in traffic levels beyond the capacity of the surrounding local highway network. There is no indication of where the site would access the road network - it could cause problems. There will be problems with traffic levels. 3) Under Policy 7 - Support for Good Design g) adopt the principles of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) We are also concerned about access for utilities, power network and foul and particularly surface water drainage. At present the existing surface water network is struggling to cope, especially during times of heavy rain, which causes flooding of the existing Wharf Road between the junctions with Cowley Lane and The Rank.	In terms of the general development in the village, provision for school places and an increase in village amenities including increased requirement for healthcare is barely mentioned and not addressed. The proposed increase of 500 to 800 in population is going to have a significant impact on all facilities and needs further analysis.					
85	Mark Hartwell & Georgina Hartwell						5, 7, 5.8, 5.9.6 (Land adjacent to Cowley Quarry behind Monks Walk and Fountain Fold housing estates) The following considerations should be given to this area marked in blue on Map 4 as Area 6 • The Agricultural land classification is designated 'Very Good' on Map 7 (the highest classification shown on this map) • This area contains one of the most important non-designated Heritage Assets in Gnosall namely Cowley Quarry. • The Historic Landscape of this area includes a single lane track between Quarry Lane and Cowley (village) which is recognisably characteristic of a 'hollow way' - (probably medieval). Any attempt to use this route for vehicular access would destroy the historic nature of the road. • The field between Cowley Quarry, Monks Walk and Fountain Fold creates a Wildlife corridor and buffer zone between existing housing infrastructure and the bio-diverse habitats and eco-system within the quarry, woods and canal. The area is listed for further investigation by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust; while the canal corridor, embankment, and surrounding residential development would encroach into open countryside.				Appendix 1 Option 3. 'What this might mean.' The following should be considered for addition to this list: • Degradation of heritage asset (site historic interest) and historic landscape (Cowley Quarry and hollow way between Quarry Lane and Cowley) • Loss of wildlife corridor separating woodland and canal from housing infrastructure • Potential risk to stability of Cowley Tunnel due to known friable nature of geology • Loss of 'Very Good' agricultural land • Strain on the road system in comparison to other options that better distribute traffic across the parish and/or have better access to the A518	The comments above and in this section relate specifically to the proposed development of 'Land adjacent to Cowley Quarry behind Monks Walk and Fountain Fold housing estates'. This is partly because this is the area we live in and which we know about, but also as this area has only been proposed in the last month or so and has, therefore, not yet been discussed in the same way other proposed areas for development have. Stability of Cowley Tunnel Cowley Tunnel on the Shropshire Union Canal runs under the edge of the field 'Land adjacent to Cowley Quarry behind Monks Walk and Fountain Fold housing estates' and under the previously mentioned 'hollow way'. It is one of the key features of the Shropshire Union canal in Gnosall. During the building of the canal the tunnel should have extended from Cowley bridge (SJ828192) to the existing tunnel. However, due to the friable nature of the sandstone in this area the tunnel collapsed along the greater length, which is now known as Cowley Cutting, leaving the shorter section of tunnel as we now know it. I would suggest that, should any development of this area be considered, then a geological survey of the area is required in order to ensure the stability of Cowley Tunnel and the surrounding landscape. Road Infrastructure Whereas for example, the development of land at Lowfields Lane gives direct and sensible access to the A518, the proposed development of 'Land adjacent to Cowley Quarry behind Monks Walk and Fountain Fold housing estates' does not. Development in this area would mean greatly increased traffic on roads throughout the village creating at least four additional pinch points. Cowley Lane is already a challenging junction, therefore, additional traffic would be a cause for concern.		
86	Graham B Fergus	First City					the NP should reflect our clients application 13/19587/OUT. Map 3 is flawed, it fails to reflect SHLAA site in 2013, land off Stafford Road. Objects to methodology used and the housing figures shown in table. Neither of the methods are based on an assessment of the full, OAN. Figures have no evidential value in terms of need. Map 4 Site 5 this site is subject to same constraints as Site 4. Map 4 Site 6, this site is not deliverable for housing and should be rejected, access issues highlighted, residential development would encroach into open countryside.					Promotion of land off Stafford road to accommodate 150 new dwellings in Gnosall and suggest this site is included in the Gnosall Neighbourhood Plan.		
87	Linda Price						Site 6 I object to this site for the following reasons: Monks Walk access would mean extra traffic down Wharf Road which gets congested at the moment with parked cars. Cowley Lane access. Cowley Lane has quite a lot of traffic at present with it being a short cut to the motorway via Chuch Eaton and large farm/delivery vehicles to the fruit farm. Cars do tend to come quite fast round the bend up to the speed limit signs. The access onto Wharf Road is also difficult with the wall at Gingercroft Nursing Home obscuring the view. As Gnosall is already experiencing a large number of houses being built, I don't think that the village or the housing market need any more. Site 4 May be difficult obtaining house insurance due to close proximity of the brook.							
88	Chortell Buchanan	First City Ltd on behalf of Mr Talbot					Promotion of Land behind Old Barn Close (1ha) site for housing. Site has the capacity to accommodate in the region of 20-30 dwellings offering a mix of market and affordable housing ranging from 2 bedroomed first time buyer accommodation to larger family homes							
89	Penny McKnight	Stafford Borough Council	Senior Conservation Officer			Para 3.30 - There is an opportunity to make more specific policies to address local needs. The SBC Gnosall Conservation Area Appraisal, for example, could be used to identify specific heritage issues within Gnosall. (2) "Conservation Area" should read "Conservation Areas" as the parish includes Norbury Canal Junction CA and the Shropshire Union Canal CA, as well as Gnosall. (3) I understand that the NP would be an additional consideration and not supersede the NPPF and PPSB heritage policies, but I think it would still be useful to caveat some policies where they may also have heritage implications.	Policy 1(a): suggested amendment: "residential amenity and the neighbourhood, rural or historic character...." Policy 2: suggested addition: "any conversion of heritage assets would be carried out in a manner that protects their heritage significance"	Map 4: (1) Site 4 lies immediately adjacent to the Gnosall Conservation Area boundary, and sites 5 and 6 adjacent to the Shropshire Union Canal Conservation Area. This need not rule out development, but would require special attention to be paid to protecting the special character and appearance of the conservation area through appropriate siting, height, mass and design. (2) The inclusion of protected open space within the Gnosall Conservation Area is welcomed. However, that area off Sellman Street could be extended to cohere with the area identified in the Gnosall Conservation Area Appraisal. (3) Evidence will need to be provided to support any proposals for the housing sites, which should include identification of any heritage assets through the Historic Environment Record Office (HER) and assessment of the potential impact upon them.	Policy 5: I think this needs clarification as to which criteria are 'ands' and which 'one', e.g. (e) would always apply, but not (c). Policy 6: I would caution against encouraging 'infill' development within the conservation area without further specification. The Gnosall Conservation Area Appraisal identified the potential to enhance the character of the conservation through reinstating the building line of the high street, but also harm to the special interest of the area by uncharacteristic siting, including backland locations or subdivision of burgage plots.	Policy 11: The areas identified as the Areas of Special Protection on the Proposals Map are those referred to under Policy 8: Open Space and Recreation. Do these policies therefore need to be combined/cross-referenced? The policy refers to 'heritage' values for these sites; this would need to be substantiated in supporting evidence.	I would be happy to discuss the way forward on any heritage issues with the Working Group if required.			
90	Barry Oliver											The balance of the neighbourhood plan has too much focus on new housing development. We need a more sustainable balance for the community with improved amenity, natural environment, community sports facilities, a balance housing development which builds improved social enterprise. Excessive housing developments like the loop are not appropriate.		
91	Sandy Richards			Satisfactory	Misleading information in places	Informative	Find the statistics in 4.1 difficult to believe	Satisfactory	Second para - policy 3. Why are the three sites referred to as 'preferred' and being identified on the Plan (P. 27)?	Satisfactory	Why did recreational facilities in Gnosall Heath become a priority in the Neighbourhood Plan?	Policy 11 - where is the proposals map? Do all housing distribution options have to be included in a neighbourhood plan?		
92	John Robert Pritchard			Good but page references would be helpful. Suggests at the end of bullet point 2 on page 4, add text - The Policies are referenced 1 to 14 throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document.		Good explanation. Presumably page 8, para 3.27 will be updated?	o.k.	Page 13, column 2, why are last 4 paragraphs in bold? The word 'has' is repeated in the first line. Page 16 - Title of map should be 'Proposed Settlement Boundary'. There should only be 1 boundary and map (page 27). If these are the ones marked in blue then why are they marked 'preferred'. To what and for what reason? Presumably table 1 figures will be updated?	Page 18, para 6.14 - suggest last 5 lines to be in bold as important. 2nd para of Policy 3 - three sites are referred to as 'preferred' and being 'identified on the plan (page 27)'. They are not identified on the map (page 27). If these are the ones marked in blue then why are they marked 'preferred'. To what and for what reason? Presumably table 1 figures will be updated?	Page 23, para 7.4 suggest the last sentence stating 'This is a settlement boundary' in section 5 should be in bold as it is important. Also at the end of this sentence, helpful to insert (Page 14, marked by the black line).	Page 24, Policy 8 - questions evidence about if recreation in Gnosall Heath is necessary or required let alone priority. This would create a major imbalance between village and Heath.	Page 26, Policy 11, line 4 - Where is the Proposals Map? Page 29, Policy 14, line 7. The word 'of' is needed between 'sources' and 'funding'. Page 29, Policy 14, sub clause (ii). The NP should suggest where the recreational facilities are located.	this is not necessary and should therefore be excluded. Inclusion suggests doubt of what has been proposed.	Suggestions to insert the following page references: On page 9, para 3.28 line 9 add - (See pages 11 and 12). On page 9, para 3.29 line 13 add - (See pages 18 and 21). On page 9, para 3.30 last line add - (See pages 24 and - 26). On page 10, para 3.31 line 11 add - (See page 29). On page 13, column 1, line 2 after 'Policy 3' add - (See page 18). On page 23, column 1, line 4, after 'Appendix' add - (See pages 30, 31 and 32). Note: all the above additions (if included) should be in brackets, as shown.
93	Simon Air									I object to possible building on sites 1, 4, 5 and 6 on map 4.				

94	Helen Air							Prefer for existing boundary not to be extended to include proposed developments 1, 5 and 6.		I object to possible building on sites 1,4,5 and 6 on map 4. Site 4 has risk of flooding. Site 6 would result in too many houses, there is no access. Odd infilling is acceptable.	Agree with protecting existing rights of way and local environmental sites. Good if this could be extended.		admire the level of work involved in producing the Neighbourhood Plan. Protect the Horseshoe (Loop) from development.
95	Mrs C Wood and Mr G Isaacs							Objection to building on land to the rear of Old Barn Close due to vehicle access (blind bend either way), disturbance and loss of wildlife, destruction of the environment, no bus service here, traffic congestion.					
96	Mrs T Mullin							Concern about the field behind Monks Walk due to: Lack of adequate drainage, light and noise pollution, unsustainability of local services, i.e. doctors, school, access problems, overlook properties on Monks Walk and spoil privacy.					
97	Ellen Louise parry		Agree	Agree	Agree	Travel to work is much higher than the average. This should be considered for all planning applications especially for proposed development on the Loop.	Agree	no more houses are needed. The village will become over developed.		8.2 The natural environment is held in high regard, lets hope this is taken into consideration regarding the proposed 90 houses on the Loop. 8.6 I feel the Loop and Horseshoe should be included when talking about fortunate open green spaces. 8.12 - agree.	Policy 11 - Agree, The Loop and Horseshoe should be protected.	The Neighbourhood Plan is good. Agree generally with content.	
98	Jennifer Winkle							The new settlement boundary should not be extended very much beyond the old RDB to maintain the character of the village	Policy 7 - fully support all parts - any new properties must be in character for the village		Policy 9 - All existing rights of way should be maintained and signage improved if necessary. Policy 11 the Loop should be maintained as a nature wildlife area, to provide a peaceful and tranquil leisure walk for villagers and preserve an important part of the village's heritage.	Option 4 would be most preferable to provide small developments throughout Gnosall and gnosall Heath	Thanks.
99	Ronald Joseph Winkle			Para 1.5. Retaining areas of specific environmental interest and those of leisure/outdoor pursuits valued by the community are of paramount importance to the village.	K04 - ensure any new proposals are well balanced to the needs of the community, particularly that of health and well-being.	3.27 - having already has more than our fair share of housebuilding any further developments should be small in keeping with that of a village, not massive town like ones.	4.9 - modern technology has enabled many people to work from home or outlying premises. A village environment is suitable for most people to pursue this type of employment.	5.5 - in principle this is a positive solution to future development. Extra-care should be taken to balance and infill with the surrounding environment.	6.8 - Gnosall village is where a lot of retired people wish to retreat to. Any small development should encourage this fact by providing Bungalows with gardens (there are so few being built).	7.4 - sustainable housing not mass development.	8.1 Perfect concept. A must for protecting our heritage.	Policy 9 and 10. Please maintain/improve all rights of way. Policy 11 - Audmore Loop Horseshoe - this proposed area of special protection is valued by numerous persons. It is unique and must be retained for future generations to enjoy.	A very well documented piece of work, thank you for all the hard work.
100	Eric Seymore Myatt												Policy 9 and 10. I fully agree with this. Policy 11 - I'm nearly 80 year's old. The Loop must be kept so the next generation can enjoy it.
101	June Mellor												A agree with all points. Please protect the Loop for future generations. I walk this 2 or 3 times a day. It keeps me fit. I'm 83 and have lived here for 53 years.
102	Pat Boulton												As you can see from my address I am absolutely biased with regards the Loop. However, I feel that this Plan on the whole will be good for Gnosall. I also would like to see smaller houses and bungalows as we would like to downsize if we could sell our own house here.
103	Jane Galdien							Generally I approve the settlement boundary but I would like to see Weavers Hill included.					
104	Frederic Mouton												I approve and support the plan.
105	Mrs Kathleen J. Bradley		An informative, comprehensive introduction	Good but thought present roads system would have been included.	Activities mainly sedentary. Energetic and competitive require an outdoor sport (tennis, crown, bowling) benefit to all ages, both sexes. 24 houses a day and juniors and seniors can integrate during school holidays. Developments generate extra traffic - this can not be glossed over.	There's little one can suggest about the job situation. Those who choose to live in a village must be aware of it too and be prepared to travel daily by car is more convenient and petrol prices lower. Back to the traffic problem - congestion and pollution.	Map 4 for settlement boundary. Is site 1 classes as rural since it's outside. Access to site 1 via Old Barn Close is not acceptable. Old Barn Close is a narrow road built to serve 25 houses and 7 in Hudson Vlose. Extra traffic will cross a green play area and incline possibly causing driving in low gears. Outer travel Old Barn Close join s Moorend Lane are 2 blind bends. Moorend Lane better option - void of houses. Whole stretch is very busy - must be a short cut. Also farm traffic.	Ref 6.14 states allocation of 230 houses. This seem a fair amount and one that can be absorbed in Gnosall. Not knowing what the total population will be but lets hope the school and doctors can handle the increase.	A difficult section to comprehend due to colour coding as it stands at present and feel many decisions will be centred around home addresses after long and careful scrutiny I have decided Option 4.	Reading this brings home what we are already blessed with and enjoy - it must be protected.	Added to list for consideration, crown green and tennis courts. Bowling very popular for all ages.	Option 4 my choice - reason being whether site 1 is in our out of settlement boundary. Any further development will be small max 10 houses and would be dispersed.	Any mention of the road system, congestion doesn't appear to be accepted in the way it is meant. No-one is expecting major constructional changes but a one-way system should be considered. Congestion on main street due to parking is a problem.
106	Kevin & Annette Lees - bank cottage Gnosall Chris & Becky lees - moss farm yarn field Stafford Wendy & Andrew haycock - Glendower close Gnosall Derek & Sylvia lees - the rank Gnosall Chris blunt - high street Gnosall Francesca Lees - high street Gnosall Juliet Hoyle - high street Gnosall												In response to the pre submission consultation dated December 2014 As owners of the land proposed as an area of special protection adjacent to the dismantled railway at plardwick on the nor bury road (page 27 of consultation document) we hereby lodge our objection to this proposed designation. At no point has this proposal been discussed with us and we request details of the reasons behind such a proposal. Based upon points raised within the plan we can see no logic or reason for this land being given special protection.
107	James Chadwick	Staffordshire County Council			Welcome that the Plan references NPPF and PFSB. These planning documents consider the historic environment in some detail (Section 2 of NPPF) and Policy N9 Historic Environment of PFSB. As Section 3.3 of the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges Policy N9 relates to the various aspects of the historic environment within the borough including the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and that these are a material consideration in the planning process. The Policy also addresses the issues of new development and the requirement that it should "enhance the significance of heritage assets and their setting by understanding the heritage interest, encouraging sustainable re-use and promoting high design quality" as well as requiring new development to take into consideration the impact upon archaeological remains. It may also be useful to note that the wider historic landscape is a material consideration under Policy N8 'Landscape Character' of PFSB.	We acknowledge that the settlement boundary is to change to incorporate proposed housing sites and those that have already gained consent. We note that there is a current planning appeal underway and inquiry to be held for the site to the south of Stafford Road. Although we appreciate this is not explicitly referenced in the plan, it is worth flagging at this stage for the next stage of your plan making that the plan may need to be updated depending on the outcome of the appeal. We are aware of the Division member's opposition to the site and it is worth being aware of recent appeal decisions made by the Secretary of State with regard to planning cases in similar circumstances to yours, and the importance he has given to emerging neighbourhood plans in determining localy where development should be directed.	See detailed response which provides guidance for the Neighbourhood Plan to include. To assist with facilitating appropriate change within farming complexes the Neighbourhood Plan may wish to link their policies to the Staffordshire Farmsteads Guidance, which is due to be finalised shortly (actual documents are referenced in the response). The Neighbourhood Plan could demonstrate the key aspects of the built environment which are considered to be characteristic of the local area and by which to judge appropriate good design. The Neighbourhood Plan may wish to consider extending this approach beyond the Conservation Area to take account of the characteristics of the wider settlement, which may look at boundary treatments, the sense of space within and around the buildings in different parts of the village, as well as the style of the buildings themselves. (Examples of Character assessments contained in response). In relation to Policy 7 part (j) we request a slight addition to ensure that the use of hedges and trees on highway boundaries does not affect the highway and suggest liaison with the highway authority be required. We would suggest adding the following to the end of (j) '...the species, type and location of any tree and/or hedge planted adjacent to a public highway shall be appropriate to		Recommend amending Policy 10 - Include general information around the landscape character of the Parish so that development is sympathetic to it, specifically the northern/southern part of the Plan (Ancient Clay Farmlands landscape character). A policy should be in place which seeks to retain and enhance mature trees and hedgerows which provide established landscape structure. We welcome the information within the plan and the aspirations to improve off road accessibility within the Parish. The County Council is able to support certain path improvement schemes through the Community Paths Initiative which is a once yearly funding stream to improve the path network in parishes across the County. We also welcome the information in respect of protecting and enhancing the path network where development is proposed. We note that the list of Local Priorities for infrastructure in Policy 14 does not include any local highway proposals.	There are a number of woodlands within the plan area which are recorded as ancient semi-natural woodland in the Staffordshire Inventory of Ancient Woodland (Provisional), 1993. These include Nut Wood, Hell Hole, Lindore Wood, Polesworth and Walton Wood. A policy which seeks to protect these ancient woodland sites from the impact of development and land use change is recommended.			
108	Mrs Enid Bunting												Does not agree with the total development area suggested due to the lack of additional employment opportunities available in Stafford/Newport.
109	Andazej Mewryk Kalaga												Approves of the Plan
110	Stefania Elizabeth Kalaga												Approves of the Plan
111	Maria Kalaga												I agree with the proposed Plan

112	John Nichol			Good	Good but I felt there wasn't enough said to help diversify the leisure/recreation offer to local people.	Agreed	Agreed. Gnosall should not encourage sites for industrial units as these will simply become warehouses and attract more HGVs. Best approach is to support local businesses especially those based at home and to ensure Gnosall is covered by excellent telecommunications and SFBD. Extra mobile phone masts for EE and Vodafone would be useful in this respect.	Agreed. I welcome the exclusion of the Loop and also the County Council site off Lowfield Lane.		Section 7: Housing Distribution Agreed	Generally agreed. However I am disappointed that the NP hasn't taken the opportunity to discuss recreation facilities. The loss of the school pool means that there needs to be serious consideration for a site to be identified to have a new pool built plus gym/sports hall/tennis courts. There is plenty of land on the school field to take such a facility or near the "Social club". It should also be noted that the proposed new primary school will only have the one small hall in it which is unsuitable for hiring out for sports use.	I am not sure why the rebuilding of the Grosvenor centre is considered to be a priority and what the justification is. There is already a large village hall with its annex scout/guide building as well as other meeting facilities such as in the Methodist church and fire station so we are not short of such places. However if it was combined with the sports facilities as referred to in the previous box then this would be more acceptable.		Congratulations on a well written document. I have only a few points of concern which relates to leisure/recreation facilities. Otherwise well done.
113	Anthony Muller	Natural England									Welcome Policies 8-11, which supplement local plan policies N4, N5, N7 and N9. Also supportive of Policy 7.			The parish may wish to consider additional sources of information as the plan develops. This is available at http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/PDF/GEHO0212BWAZ-E-E.pdf . This response provides other additional sources.
114	Rachel Bust	Coal Authority	Chief Planner											The Neighbourhood Plan Area is outside of the defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.