

# WOLVERHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL

## DECISION STATEMENT – TETTENHALL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

### 1. Summary

Following an independent Examination, Wolverhampton City Council now confirms that the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum.

This decision statement and copies of the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting documentation are available to view on the Council's website: [www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning](http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning)

Hard copies of the decision statement are available for inspection at the following locations:

- Council Offices, Reception 24, Civic Centre, St Peter's Square, Wolverhampton, WV1 1RP
- Tettenhall Library, St. Michael's Parish Centre, Upper Street, Wolverhampton, WV6 8QF
- Finchfield Library, White Oak Drive, Wolverhampton, WV3 9AF
- Wolverhampton Central Library, Snow Hill, City Centre, Wolverhampton, WV1 3AX

### 2. Background

In 2011, the Tettenhall wards (which include Tettenhall Regis and Tettenhall Wightwick) were selected as a frontrunner Neighbourhood Planning area and the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan for the Tettenhall wards of Wolverhampton began.

In December 2012, Wolverhampton City Council designated Tettenhall Neighbourhood Forum as a formal Neighbourhood Forum for the purpose of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for the area in accordance with Part Three of the Town and Country Planning (England), Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Following the submission of the draft Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan to the Council in January 2014, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ran for 6 weeks and ended on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

In March 2014 Wolverhampton City Council, with the agreement of Tettenhall Neighbourhood Forum, appointed an independent examiner, Mr Jeremy Edge, to review whether the Neighbourhood Plan met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and should proceed to referendum.

The examiner's report was completed on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2014 and has been made available for public viewing. The examiner's report concludes that subject to making the minor modifications recommended by the examiner the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

Wolverhampton City Council, in agreement with the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Forum, has made the modifications proposed by the examiner, to secure that the draft plan meets the basic conditions. Table 1 sets out these modifications and the action to be taken in respect of each of them.

The Council agrees with the Examiner's recommendation that there is no reason to extend the Neighbourhood Plan area (Tettenhall Regis and Tettenhall Wightwick wards) for the purposes of holding the referendum.

The Examiner has concluded that with the specified modifications the Plan meets the basic conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The Council concurs with this view and is therefore satisfied that the modified version of the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions specified by statute and complies with the provision made by or under Section 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Therefore to meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 a referendum which poses the question 'Do you want Wolverhampton City Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for the Tettenhall Wards area covering Tettenhall Regis and Tettenhall Wightwick to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?' will be held in the referendum area (comprising Tettenhall Regis and Tettenhall Wightwick Wards).

The date on which the referendum will take place is agreed as Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> July 2014.

**Table 1: Schedule of Modifications Recommended in the Examiner’s Report**

Page in Examination Version of Plan	Examiners Recommendation	Reason	Action to be taken
p.57 & p.91	Core Strategy policy references to be revised.	The cross referenced list of relevant strategic policies of the Core Strategy have truncated.	Revise list of Core Strategy policy references on p.57 and p.91.
p.57	All references to UDP Policy N1, Promotion of Nature Conservation should be deleted.	The UDP Policy N1, Promotion of Nature Conservation, is not included in the list of saved policies of the Wolverhampton UDP.	Delete all references to UDP Policy N1 from the Plan.
p.21 – Policy TNP1 – Diverse Local Economy	Amend to: “Proposals will also need to meet the requirements of relevant strategic policies in the NPPF and Local Plan, such as those on Town Centre Uses (Policies CEN2 and CEN4-7) and Green Belt (Core Strategy CSP2, and UDP Saved Policy G2).”	The final paragraph of the justification of policy TNP1 is inaccurate. This alteration is proposed because Core Strategy policies CEN1 and CEN3 relate to Strategic Centres (which are defined within Core Strategy Policy CEN2).	Amend text as advised.
p.24 – Policy TNP2 – Macrome Road Industrial Estate	Delete: “ <del>there are satisfactory arrangements in place for the relocation of existing occupiers in Wolverhampton;</del> ”	The land use planning system should not seek to dictate where land owners relocate in the event that they chose to move their business.	Delete this element of Policy TNP2.
p.25 – Policy TNP2 – Macrome Road Industrial Estate	Amend to: “...the railway line where the development of the entire site is proposed, to create and maintain existing ecological networks. Where phased development is proposed such soft landscaping should be provided along the railway boundary comprised within the subject development phase, consistent	The Examiner recommends that the policy be amended to avoid ambiguity.	Amend text as advised.

	<b>with providing an integrated landscaped boundary along the entire length of the boundary on completion of the redevelopment of the whole site.”</b>		
p.31 – Policy TNP4 – Community Facilities and Buildings	Amend to: “Proposals for the loss <b>or</b> redevelopment or change of use of these sites and premises will be determined against saved UDP Policy C3.”	There is a typographical error in the final sentence of the Examination draft Plan.	Replace ‘ore’ with ‘or’.
p.31 – Policy TNP4 – Community Facilitates and Buildings	Amend to: “The area has strength in depth in terms of active community groups and organisations. Current community meeting places are well used and sometimes over-subscribed, eg. Tettenhall Institute, <b>St Columba’s</b> Church Hall, the Newman Centre, Christ Church Jubilee Room”	There is a further typographical error in the policy Justification.	Replace ‘St Columbus’ with ‘St Columba’.
p.36 – Policy TNP5 – Public Houses	Amend to: “-1a) the public house has been marketed, for at least the previous 12 months, as a public house free of tie and restrictive covenant (to a particular brewery) and for alternative use as another type of community facility, with an agency <b>agreed with the Council</b> , <del>which specialises in the sale of pubs</del> , at a price <del>agreed with the Council</del> following an independent professional valuation, undertaken by the District Valuer, <b>or other agency with experience and expertise of property values for public houses and community uses within the Plan area</b> , (paid for by the developer), and there has been no interest in the building <b>for such uses; as a public house, or other community facility;”</b>	The Examiner recommends that the policy text at 1a) should be revised.	Amend text as advised.
p.38 – Policy TNP5 – Public Houses	“Existing policy relating to pubs and community facilities is set out in the UDP policy C3. <del>but it the community felt more detailed guidance is required.”</del>	The final sentence of the policy justification requires alteration for clarity.	Amend text as suggested.
p.43 – Policy TNP7 – Community Involvement and Consultation	Amend wording in Policy TNP7: <b>“- any other major planning applications for development in the Plan area comprising:</b> <b>(a) the provision of dwellinghouses where —</b> <b>(i) the number of dwellinghouses to be provided is 10 or more; or</b> <b>(ii) the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectares or more and it is not known whether the development falls within sub-paragraph (a)(i);</b> <b>(d) the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more; or</b> <b>(e) development carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more;</b>	For development control purposes it will be necessary to carefully define those development proposals which would require the community engagement and consultation covered by this policy. In this regard and to avoid any ambiguity as to what constitutes	Amend policy wording to avoid ambiguity as to what constitutes major development.

	<del>–any other major planning applications residential and non-residential, in the Plan area;</del>	major development, further definition is required, since “major development” is not clear within the policy. Accordingly, it is suggested that the policy be amended using the definition of major development in the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, as abridged for neighbourhood planning purposes.	
P.46 – Policy TNP8 – General Housing	The statement in Policy TNP8 should be changed to “ <b>up to 390 new homes</b> ”. “.....-proposals do not adversely impact on other <b>adopted</b> policies within this Plan and Local Plan Documents, particularly those that relate to density, character, environment, traffic and transport, design quality and sustainable buildings” .....	The SHLAA (2013) identifies the potential to deliver 390 new homes in the Plan area up to 2016. Therefore, the statement in Policy TNP8 needs to be changed to ‘390’.  A minor amendment to the policy to the effect that the consideration given to the impact of housing proposals should be considered in relation to the adopted Local Plan documents.	Replace ‘315’ with ‘390’.  Insert ‘adopted’ into text.  Update the housing figures in the justification in light of the examiner’s comments on the SHLAA (2013) report.
P.50 – Policy TNP9 –	“... designated <b>as</b> Local Green Space...”	A single typographical	Replace ‘a’ with ‘as’.

Penk Rise		correction is required to the policy in the first sentence.	
P.55 – Policy TNP11 – Houses of Multiple Occupation	<p>Amend text in Policy TNP11 to:</p> <p><b>“Planning permission to allow change of use to houses in multiple occupation (sui generis) will not be permitted except where development proposals shall demonstrate;”</b></p> <p>“- Appropriate internal and external amenity space, refuse storage and car and bicycle parking <b>shall</b> be provided in a manner which is well integrated into the design of the development, without compromising the garden setting of larger houses;”</p> <p><del>“- The proposal would not result in an over concentration of HMOs in any one part of the two wards, to the extent that it would change the character of the area or undermine the maintenance of a balanced and mixed local community.”</del></p>	To ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.	Amend text as advised.
P.60 & p.61, Policy TNP12 Part A – New Development to Enhance and Respect Existing Local Character	<p>Amend Policy TNP12 Part A to:</p> <p>“New Development to <del>Enhance and</del> <b>Respect</b> Existing Local Character New development (including alterations, change of use and extensions) must <del>enhance</del>, respect ....”</p> <p>“- Using a choice of traditional materials <del>and colours</del> should complement the surrounding context.”</p>	The Examiner is concerned that a) the requirement for development proposals to enhance local character of the local area may be difficult to achieve; b) that controlling the colour of development may infringe permitted development rights.	Amend text as advised.
P.61 & p.62, Policy TNP12 Part B – Protecting Locally Important Views	<p>Amend Policy TNP12 Part B to:</p> <p>- roofscape should reflect adjacent roofscapes of existing buildings.</p> <p>Development should take account of <b>and seek to protect and enhance</b> important views, landmarks and local points in the area, <b>having regard to other policies in the Plan.</b></p> <p><del>Developments which adversely affect important views will not be supported.</del></p>	<p>The examiner recommends that the policy be relaxed in order to reflect national planning policy.</p> <p>Alter figure number and figure heading on page 61 and 63.</p>	Amend text as advised.

	<p>figure 21.</p> <p>The figure heading on page 63 of the Plan should read, “Figure 21 A selection of locally important views”.</p>		
P.64 & P.65, Policy TNP12 Part D – Historic Environment	Figure 23	The figure reference is incorrect and should be amended on page 65.	Amend figure number as advised.
P.68-69, Policy TNP13 – Protect, enhance and extend designated nature conservation areas	<p>Include “running water” to the list of key features in paragraph 2 at page 70.</p> <p>At paragraph 3 on page 71 re-word to read:  “.....this biodiversity is not confined to the designated sites and nature conservation areas and the Smestow Brook, but in the environment in the form of...”</p> <p>“...should <del>positively</del> contribute positively” para 4, policy box, page 68.</p> <p>Add new paragraph to Policy TNP13: “The channel of the Smestow Brook shall be improved and enhanced to create a more natural feature and the marginal habitats shall be enhanced in line with the requirement of the Severn Basin Management Plan. Any development which poses a risk of pollution to the Smestow Brook and therefore may result in the waterbody not meeting its legal objectives under the Water Framework Directive shall not be permitted.”</p>	<p>The Examiner supports the Environment Agency’s suggestion to include “running water” to the list of key features in para 2 on page 70 and para 3 on page 71 should be re-worded as indicated.</p> <p>The split infinitive should be corrected in the fourth paragraph of this policy. The Examiner therefore recommends that the draft policy is revised as indicated.</p>	<p>In para 2 on page 70 insert “running water” as indicated.</p> <p>Amend text as advised in para 3 on page 71, and add new text to create paragraph 6 as indicated.</p>
P.71-75, Policy TNP14 Part A – Identify new sites and protect and improve existing open spaces	<p>In Policy TNP14 on page 74, amend figure reference in a) to figure 25.</p> <p>Amend text in b) to: “The open space improvement requirements within the Neighbourhood Plan area are identified in Wolverhampton City Council’s Open Spaces Strategy and Action Plan, February 2014, (pages 52-55). <del>At the time of writing this Plan, Wolverhampton City Council is finalising the updated Open Spaces Strategy and Action Plan (listed at Appendix O) which identifies all open space improvement requirements within the Neighbourhood Plan area.”</del></p> <p>Amend text in c) to: “larger scheme, shall <del>, will be expected to</del> provide” ... “the</p>	The policy requires amendment to reflect the up to date position of Wolverhampton City Council’s Open Spaces Strategy and Action Plan, which was finalised after the Examination version of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Amend text as advised.

	<p><del>benefit of both new and existing</del> residents <del>and</del>; make a <del>reasonable</del>”</p> <p>“-Macrome Road - requirements for open space, should part or all of the site come forward for housing during the life of the Plan.”</p>		
P.79-80, Policy TNP15 – Trees	<p>Amend Policy TNP15 as follows:</p> <p>“Where <del>trees</del>, approved as part of a landscape scheme, <del>trees</del> have to be removed as a result of”</p> <p>“Then, <del>within a period of five years from the completion of the landscape scheme, such trees affected shall be replaced by replacement trees be required</del> of a <del>size and</del> species compatible with the location, on the same site, or if <del>practicable on a</del> suitable site nearby.”</p> <p>The replacement trees <del>must shall</del> be planted within 12 months of the removal/loss <del>of the existing trees.</del>”</p>	In order for this policy to be acceptable for development control purposes, the examiner considers that the policy will require amendments as indicated.	Amend text as advised.
P.80-82, Policy TNP16 – Sustainable Buildings	<p>Amend Policy TNP16 to:</p> <p><del>“Proposals which We will welcome developers who</del> are seeking to achieve low or zero carbon emission schemes and <del>which offer the use of have given thought to using</del> renewable energy sources <del>shall be encouraged.</del>”</p> <p><del>“Proposals for development shall incorporate SuDs techniques that will reduce flood risk and improve water quality. New developments shall increase tree cover and consider the use of green roofs.”</del></p> <p>- New development should be of high quality, bespoke design, with architectural detailing and boundary treatments which <del>complement</del> the surrounding area in line with Policy TNP12 Historic Environment and Local Character.</p> <p><del>-be built to at least the minimum space standard requirements of the latest Homes and Communities Agency that apply to affordable housing. The schedule at Appendix P specifies the current space standards required (HQIv4 April 2008). Planning application drawings should demonstrate how furniture can be accommodated in habitable rooms.</del></p>	<p>The reference to housing standards in Policy TNP16 may be deleted.</p> <p>The Lifetime Homes Checklist referred to in this policy is missing from Appendix P.</p> <p>It is probable that Lifetimes Homes will no longer have force or purpose in a town planning context. The examiner therefore proposes that this policy component should also be deleted.</p>	Amend text as advised.



	<p><del>–should meet Lifetime Homes Standards to ensure that new homes are adaptable to the changing requirements of occupiers in future years. The developer will be required to submit a complete Lifetime Homes checklist as at Appendix P to evidence that they have complied with these standards.</del></p> <p><del>–should achieve a score of 75% green and no red against Building For Life 12 (or the equivalent standards in future years) The developer will be required to assess the proposal against Building For Life 12 criteria and demonstrate that this requirement has been met. (The criteria can be found at <a href="http://www.designcouncil.org.uk">www.designcouncil.org.uk</a> see Appendix P).</del></p> <p><b>Commercial Development</b></p> <p><del>–New commercial development should provide secure cycle parking so that people can cycle to work.</del></p> <p>The Justification to be amended by deleting the following: <del>“We also want to ensure our new homes provide sufficient space for furniture and the daily activities of residents both now and in the future to meet their changing needs. We therefore want to apply the same standards required by the Homes and Communities Agency for new affordable housing, to all new residential developments which will include meeting the Building for Life and Lifetime Homes standard.</del></p> <p><del>By requiring developers to implement these standards we will be ensuring that the new homes built in the NP area are of the highest quality for the West Midlands area and attract new people into the city.”</del></p>	<p>The reference made to Building for Life 12 should also be deleted as it does not provide a sound basis against which a planning judgement should be made for assessing planning applications.</p> <p>In relation to the recommended alteration to Policy TNP16, it is suggested that the justification for the policy is also amended.</p>	
P.83-85, Policy TNP17 – Telecommunications Equipment	Delete policy and justification.	The Examiner recommends that the policy and justification is deleted as the planning system is unable to support draft Policy TNP17.	Delete Policy TNP17 and its justification.
P.85-86, Policy TNP18 – Light Pollution	Amend text in Policy TNP18 to: “glare and spillage is minimised through good design, particularly on the edge of	The Examiner recommends that the second bullet	Insert “rivers” into the second bullet

	residential areas, adjacent to highways, canals, rivers, nature reserves or other environmentally sensitive settings;”	point in the draft policy be amended to include river corridors as it will be beneficial for the purpose of development control and reducing harm from light pollution in these habitats.	point in the policy wording.
P.91, 7.4 Policies – Traffic and Transport	Correct textual references in the introduction to Section 7.4 on page 91.	The textual references in the introduction to this section of the Plan have become corrupted in relation to the relevant strategic policies in the Black Country Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan.	Correct textual references on page 91.
P.92-97, Policy TNP19 – To Promote Road Safety	<p>Policy wording to be changed to:</p> <p>“Planning permission will not be granted in the Tettenhall wards for development proposals that are likely to have a significant effect on traffic safety, unless they are accompanied by proposals demonstrating how they impact on road safety; and where relevant the locations identified on figures 30 and 31, comprising safety improvements and proposed 20 mph speed limit zones respectively.</p> <p>Development proposals shall identify appropriate measures to mitigate adverse effects on highway safety including, as appropriate the site specific improvements identified in figure 29.</p> <p>Any road safety measures should have due regard for the character of the surrounding area as defined in the Character Studies at Appendix F to this Plan.”</p>	The Examiner has recommended that the policy is either reworded as suggested, or withdrawn from the Plan.	Amend text to suggested wording or delete policy.
P.97-102, Policy	Amendments to the justification text:	The Examiner recommends	Amend policy

<p>TNP20 – Anti-Congestion Measures</p>	<p><del>“In such circumstances the relevant Local Authority would be expected to work with Wolverhampton City Council to take relevant remedial actions.”</del></p> <p>Amend wording of Policy TNP20 to:</p> <p>“Planning permission shall not be granted for development which is likely to exacerbate congestion on the highway network. If development is likely to lead to increased traffic flows or congestion, then developers must take proportionate steps to mitigate the problems identified. Such mitigation may include the flexible use of traffic signals timing and new technologies to improve the flow of traffic at junctions, whilst considering the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>In order to reduce travel demand by car, no residential development of 10 dwellings or more, or employment development of more than 500m2 shall commence prior to the developer entering into a Green Travel Plan to provide measures to enhance accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and promote public transport to local amenities and community facilities; to reduce the propensity for local residents to use private cars for local trips and include proportionate enforcement controls.</p> <p>Planning permission for development on school sites which is likely to increase traffic levels within the Plan area shall not be permitted prior to the developer entering into a School Travel Plan designed to enhance accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and promote public transport, whilst reducing the propensity for school trips by private cars and to include appropriate enforcement measures.</p> <p>Development proposals shall contribute towards the implementation of the mitigation measures identified within the Plan at figure 29, through s106 agreements, s278 agreements under the Highways Act 1980 and through the Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate.”</p>	<p>alterations to the justification of Policy TNP20 following the Pre-Submission Consultation comments from South Staffordshire District Council.</p>	<p>wording as advised.</p>
<p>P.98, Transport Project</p>	<p>“Planning permission for development which is likely to increase traffic</p>	<p>The Examiner has re-</p>	<p>Amend policy</p>

<p>TNP21 – The Rock Junction (Site Specific Proposal)</p>	<p>congestion at the Rock Junction shall be refused unless appropriate contributions are made towards measures by WCC Highways Department to monitor traffic flows, maximise traffic capacity and, if appropriate, implement improvements such as altering signal timing and measures to increase the capacity and efficiency of the junction.”</p>	<p>worded this policy to provide a framework to facilitate the collection of developer contributions to implement investigations and subsequently measures to reduce congestion again utilising developer contributions related to appropriate development proposals.</p>	<p>wording as indicated or delete policy.</p>
<p>Page 98, Transport Project TNP22 – Aldersley Road</p>	<p>“Planning permission for development which is likely to increase traffic congestion on Aldersley Road shall be refused unless appropriate contributions are made towards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) investigating the viability of reconfiguring the road by improving through-flow of traffic and pedestrian access and;</li> <li>2) an assessment to transfer on-street parking to the field between Sandy Lane and Burland Avenue. Any such investigation shall take account of the fields’ Protected Open Space status, its landscape biodiversity quality and its proximity to a geological site. Proposals to implement a parking scheme on this site shall include the use of permeable, sustainable materials to enhance the green space and mitigate the impact of any new development within the Plan area and reduce the risk of localised flooding.</li> </ol> <p>Local residents shall be consulted with the results of each stage by the Neighbourhood Forum or Tettenhall District Community Council.”</p>	<p>The Examiner has re-worded this policy to provide a framework to facilitate the collection of developer contributions to implement investigations and subsequently measures to reduce congestion again utilising developer contributions related to appropriate development proposals.</p>	<p>Amend policy wording as indicated or delete policy.</p>
<p>P.102-103, Policy TNP23 – Adequate and Appropriate Parking Measures</p>	<p>Insert text into first paragraph in policy wording: “Subject to the provisions and parking standards in saved UDP Policy AIM12,”</p> <p>Insert text into second paragraph in policy wording: “Subject to the provisions and parking standards in saved UDP Policy AIM12,”</p> <p>Delete third and fourth paragraphs:</p> <p><del>“Where parking currently creates issues of accessibility, traffic, or detracts from local streetscape character, (for example, parking on grass verges and pavements), alternatives should be provided and restrictions implemented.</del></p>	<p>To avoid any confusion over parking standards within Tettenhall, the examiner recommends linking Policy TNP23 with the saved UDP Policy AIM12.</p>	<p>Amend text to advised.</p>

	<p><del>Steps must be taken to reduce the issues of parking around schools within or close to the Tettenhall district, and so WCC and TDCC will continue to work with schools to develop and implement appropriate measures (for example; travel plans, promotion of walking, and cycle training)."</del></p> <p>The policy justification to be amended accordingly:-  <b>"Although</b> there is a high demand for parking, in particular at local centres as well as around schools, <b>and</b> a practical parking environment is important to support local businesses, <b>the land use planning system, unless related to development proposals, is unable to be used to solve existing parking problems."</b></p> <p><b>"...an integral, sustainable and necessary part of all new development. However, the Plan acknowledges that its policies must accord with the adopted development plan policies and the extent to which parking policy can be altered will be constrained by such policy."</b></p> <p><b>"Local businesses must also be considered and where development proposals are being prepared as appropriate parking must be available to continue attracting customers to the area, but it is acknowledged that proposals must comply with the controls in UDP Policy AIM12."</b></p>		
<p>P.103-104, Policy TNP24 – Walkability Part A general</p>	<p>Amend policy wording to:  <b>"In the Tettenhall wards all significant proposals for development being for 10 dwellings or more, or greater than 500m2 of employment development shall, for reasons of promoting sustainable development in the wards of Tettenhall, be expected to contribute towards the general and site specific walkability measures, directly related to such proposals.</b></p> <p><b>The walkability measures shall comprise:</b>  <b>-Provision of adequate crossing points (pelican crossing, puffin crossing, zebra crossing, refuges etc) throughout the district in particular across major roads such as Tettenhall Road, Henwood Road or Aldersley Road, Pendeford Avenue, and also in particular at centres such as near shops, schools, residential homes, parks and other prime locations, (see figure 29 in Policy TNP20).</b></p>	<p>For clarity it is necessary to identify the proposals that will be expected to make "walkability" contributions. In the absence of evidence to the contrary and so as not to burden small developments, the Examiner has proposed that significant development in the Tettenhall context would be development of 10</p>	<p>Amend text as advised.</p>

	<p>-Provision of 20 mph speed limits in the vicinity of schools to improve safety of children travelling to school on foot. Recommended 20 mph zones around schools are shown in figure 31 on page 94. Operating times of the speed limits will be investigated further at the point of implementation for each site.</p> <p>-Waiting times for pedestrians at crossings should be revised to reduce the time it takes for the lights to change in locations where a delay is of no benefit or consequence to traffic.</p> <p>-Roads which lack pavements must be investigated and solutions provided whereby pedestrians, wheelchair users and vehicles, including bicycles, are equally safe on the road. For example through road markings, street lighting, or convex mirrors. In addition, further development should avoid creating roads without pavements, unless specifically designed for safety and to slow traffic.</p> <p>-On narrow roads without pavements, if it is not feasible or desirable due to local character, to install a proper footway on at least one side, by building adjacent paths or highway markings or else by implementing speed reduction measures such as 20 mph limits.”</p>	<p>dwelling or more, or employment development of 500m<sup>2</sup> or greater.</p>	
<p>P.103-104, Policy TNP24 – Walkability Part B Site Specific</p>	<p>Delete text:  <del>“All ‘walkable’ routes should preferably be continuous beyond the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan boundary.”</del></p>	<p>The policy should clarify that the Plan does not seek improvement beyond the Plan boundary.</p>	<p>Delete text as advised.</p>
<p>P.107-108, Policy TNP25 – Improve public transport accessibility, viability and use</p>	<p>The Examiner recommends that this policy is withdrawn.</p>	<p>The Policy does not relate statements within it to proposed land use change and development, which in turn, might give rise to impacts that could justify public transport mitigation and intervention.</p>	<p>Withdraw Policy TNP25 from the Plan.</p>
<p>P.109-112, Policy TNP26 – To promote safe cycling and improve the local cycling infrastructure</p>	<p>Delete text in figure 38 on page 109:  <del>“Old Bridge to Oxley Moor Road and the i54 along the Staffs-Worcester Canal towpath”</del></p>	<p>Amendment is needed to the schedule of identified cycling infrastructure improvements in figure 38 at page 109. References to</p>	<p>Amend text as advised.</p>

	<p>Add the following text:  “...West Wolverhampton traffic free route (north section) <b>within the Plan area</b>  Measures to consider...”</p> <p>Amendments to policy wording:  “<b>Development proposals</b> for <b>Any</b> significant new development (<b>10 or more dwellings</b>) in the Plan area <del>shall</del> <b>should</b> demonstrate how it contributes to improving the traffic free route, (using the canal and the old railway path), across western Wolverhampton or other cycle path spurs which connect this route and national cycle route 81 (see figure 40 <del>below</del>) or to local amenities such as Aldersley High School or Aldersley Stadium.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Development proposals for significant new development (comprising 10 or more dwellings or 500 m2 employment development) in the Plan area shall <del>should</del> contribute to improved road safety measures to improve education and information about cycle routes and safety and <del>safe cycling infrastructure by creating on a</del> new cycle infrastructure and <del>,cycle</del> parking. <del>and advanced stop lines where safe to do so and where it is not against the character of the area.</del></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><del>The Plan will support measures to improve education and information about cycle routes and safety.”</del></p>	<p>enhancements beyond the Plan area should be deleted.</p> <p>The Examiner proposes amendments to policy wording for significant development proposals to help deliver the objectives of the Plan, as appropriate, through new development in the Tettenhall wards.</p>	
The Plan – Other Matters	Update SA Report based on Examiner’s comments. However, the examiner believes this is not likely to give rise to any matters that would alter the conclusions that he has reached concerning the remit in the examination of the Plan.	The Examiner recommends updating the SA Report to reflect that the watercourses flow through the neighbourhood plan area and the implications on the proposals in the Plan for the improvement of these watercourses, under the EU’s Water Framework Directive.	SA report to be updated.