

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

It is noted throughout the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) summary of response that there are 'objections'. This is incorrect and misleading and must be removed. Biddulph Town Council has removed this column from the response below. None of the comments relate to concerns about the Basic Conditions.

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan Working Group response (November 2021)
Canal & River Trust	The trust has no comments to make.	No additional comment.
Highways England	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.	No additional comment.
Historic England	The Biddulph Neighbourhood Development Order commendably seeks to ensure the continued viability and vitality of the town centre.  Our previous comments remain relevant, that is:  <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>	No additional comment.
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Biddulph Neighbourhood Development Order.	No additional comment.
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	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	Please refer to comments made at Regulation 14.  The purpose of Regulation 16 is to test the Neighbourhood Development Order against the

	<p>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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<p>Basic Conditions only. Any additional commentary is beyond the scope of the consultation.</p> <p>If the Examiner wishes to suggest alternative wording, we are happy to consider this.</p>
--	--	---