

Summary of representations submitted to the examiner of the Biddulph Neighbourhood Development Order

The Submission Version of the Neighbourhood Development Order was subject to a Regulation 16 period of publication between 15 July 2021 and 27 August 2021. A total of 5 organisations submitted representations during the period of publication.

Consultee	Nature of Comment	Summary of Comment
Canal & River Trust	General	The trust has no comments to make.
Highways England	General	In relation to this consultation, our principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M6, which routes through the plan area, although the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is located approximately 10 miles away from Biddulph, with the closest junctions being the M6 J16 and J17. Based upon the scale of development and proposals within the NDO, these are unlikely to have a significant impact on the SRN.
Historic England	General	<p>The Biddulph Neighbourhood Development Order commendably seeks to ensure the continued viability and vitality of the town centre.</p> <p>Our previous comments remain relevant, that is:</p> <p><i>“Historic England has no adverse comments to make on the content of the Order and notes the positive (for the historic environment) advice/requirements set out in the conditions and design parameters in Part 1 and Part 2 of the order and in the accompanying Aecom Design Code Document”.</i></p>
Natural England	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Biddulph Neighbourhood Development Order.
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	Objection	<p>It is noted that the Town Council has responded to the comments made by the District Council at Reg 14 stage in its consultation statement and made amendments to this latest version to address most of the points made and this is welcomed. There are, however, a small number of outstanding issues from these previous comments which have not been addressed:</p> <p>At Reg 14 stage, the Council expressed concern about the wording contained within the NDO being vague and open to interpretation, highlighting that this will create problems when it is being used. In Part 1 (Replacement Shop Fronts), two points of clarity are outstanding:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Definition of lighting – it needs to be more precise as to the type of external lighting – for example a rash of swan neck lights may not be desirable.• Definition of fascia – It states that the fascia board should be timber but what about the signage to be placed on it? For example, the wording as it stands would allow for plastic signs. Would this be acceptable?
--	--	---