

Note for on issues from emerging plans – some case studies

Over 40 Neighbourhood Plans have been through the examination and referendum process. As at 31 January 2015 33 plans have now been made. These provide valuable lessons for the development and submission of future plans.

The purpose of an independent examination of a neighbourhood plan is solely to determine whether the plan meets the basic conditions provided for in the relevant legislation, and complies with the other relevant statutory requirements. The following points have been recently raised at examinations and are discussed in this note:

- The relative timing of the making of a neighbourhood plan and the adoption of a local plan;
- Meeting the requirements of strategic environmental assessment (SEA) regulations;
- The ability of Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites;

The note also includes two case studies where emerging neighbourhood plans have had a significant role in appeal decision making.

Prematurity of Neighbourhood plans in relation to Local Plans¹

The Planning Practice Guidance (issued in March 2014) provides the following guidance in respect of neighbourhood plans coming forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place:

Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its Local Plan.

A draft neighbourhood plan or Order must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic condition. A draft Neighbourhood Plan or Order is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan although the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested.

Where a neighbourhood plan is brought forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place the qualifying body and the local planning authority should discuss and aim to agree the relationship between policies in:

- the emerging neighbourhood plan
 - the emerging Local Plan
 - the adopted development plan
- with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.*

¹ Planning Practice Guidance > Guidance Neighbourhood Planning > What is neighbourhood planning? > What is a neighbourhood plan and what is its relationship to a Local Plan?
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/what-is-neighbourhood-planning/what-is-a-neighbourhood-plan-and-what-is-its-relationship-to-a-local-plan/>

The local planning authority should take a proactive and positive approach, working collaboratively with a qualifying body particularly sharing evidence and seeking to resolve any issues to ensure the draft neighbourhood plan has the greatest chance of success at independent examination.

The local planning authority should work with the qualifying body to produce complementary neighbourhood and Local Plans. It is important to minimise any conflicts between policies in the neighbourhood plan and those in the emerging Local Plan. This is because section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the conflict must be resolved by the decision maker favouring the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan.

There are a number of recent examples of neighbourhood plans being delayed due to challenges through the judicial review process which have raised questions in relation to prematurity of Neighbourhood Plans in the absence of an adopted post 2004 Local Plan and whether the neighbourhood plan has to undergo Strategic Environmental Assessment (especially when there is no post 2004 local plan in place). These cases are discussed below:

a) Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, Cheshire West and Chester

The Tattenhall neighbourhood plan went through examination and a local referendum in Autumn 2013 (a 52% turnout and 96% in favour). The decision to hold a referendum was the subject of a legal challenge which delayed the formal making of the plan. The judicial review by two housebuilders, Barratt Homes and Wainhomes was dismissed by the High Court in May 2014.

The housebuilders objected to the plan on the following grounds:

- Failure to meet SEA Directive
- Failure to meet the basic conditions
- Apparent bias of the Examiner
- Lack of evidence to support Policy 1: Housing
- Late introduction of heritage designation following Examination (withdrawn)

The Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 states that “proposals involving up to 30 homes will be allowed within or immediately adjacent to the built-up part of Tattenhall village over the period 2010 to 2030”. Barratt and Wainhomes have submitted applications to build 68 and 137 homes respectively on land in Tattenhall, and these applications therefore do not comply with Policy 1.

A significant part of the objection to the plan was the issue of prematurity because the document proposed bringing forward policies before Cheshire West and Chester Council's local plan had been examined and adopted. The Local Plan (Part 1) was submitted to the Secretary of State on 23 December 2013.

During the examination the examiner considered that it was not unusual for there to be an emerging local plan and “there is nothing in the legislation to support the contention that such a situation should stop, or slow down, the progress of a neighbourhood plan”. The examiner further noted that one of the significant benefits

of neighbourhood plans is the relative speed at which they can come forward and a *made* local plan can provide for certainty in areas where they may otherwise be an absence of up to date policy.

During the judicial review, Mr Justice Supperstone, agreed with the findings of the Examiner on this issue. Mr Justice Supperstone accepted that the only statutory requirement imposed by Condition (e) of the Basic Conditions is that the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole should be in general conformity with the adopted Development Plan as a whole. He states “*Whether or not there was any tension between one policy in the Neighbourhood Plan and one element of the eventual emerging Local Plan was not a matter for the Examiner to determine*”.

The judgement further notes: “*Whereas a local plan needs to be “consistent with national policy”, by contrast the function of an examiner, most importantly, in relation to a Neighbourhood Plan is to determine whether the plan meets the “basic conditions”. In that regard the Examiner has a discretion to determine whether or not it is appropriate that the Plan shall proceed “having regard to” national policy and guidance and has to make a judgment whether or not the Neighbourhood Plan is “in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan”.*

The Neighbourhood Plan was subsequently made on 4 June 2014. The Plan now forms part of the Development Plan for Cheshire West and Chester and will be taken into account in local planning decisions.

Further information can be found here:

http://www.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/your_council/policies_and_performance/council_plans_and_strategies/planning_policy/neighbourhood_planning/tattenhall_and_district_neighb.aspx

A copy of the Judicial Review judgement can be found here:

<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2014/1470.html>

b) Winslow Neighbourhood Plan, Aylesbury Vale

Examination of the Winslow Neighbourhood Plan, Aylesbury Vale, was also delayed following a legal submission by Gladman Developments which challenged whether it would be unlawful for the plan to come into force in the absence of an adopted district-wide strategy.

Aylesbury Vale Council had withdrawn its draft local plan because of concerns expressed by the Inspector that it had failed to meet the duty to cooperate.

The draft neighbourhood plan proposed the allocation of five sites for 455 new homes over the plan period, up to 2031. Gladman Developments has significant land interests within Winslow, including unresolved planning appeals relating to land in the Winslow neighbourhood plan area. They considered that the plan effectively acted to restrict growth. The Developers argued the neighbourhood plan to be unlawful because it sought to give effect to an emerging local plan that has been withdrawn.

Nigel McGurk, the Examiner of the neighbourhood decided to postpone the hearing on the Neighbourhood Plan on the basis that the postponement is sensible in the light of the developers’ stance regarding the plan and until the outcome of the judicial review of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan is known. Following publication of the

Tattenhall decision (as above) along with the publication of Planning Guidance (March 2014) which provided clarity on the matter the examination took place in May 2014 and the Plan was made on 10 September 2014.

Gladman Developments subsequently submitted a Judicial Review claim seeking to overturn Aylesbury Vale District Council's decision to allow the plan to proceed to referendum and then to 'make' the document. This time Gladman objected to policies in the plan that restrict development to land within the "Winslow Settlement Area" and also argued that its housing target was not based on an objective assessment of local need.

Mr Justice Lewis dismissed the claim in December 2014 ruling that the council had been fully entitled to refer the neighbourhood plan to a referendum, and to make it after residents voted in favour of it. He also found that the plan's examiner, Nigel McGurk, had complied with national planning policy and European Union law and gave good reasons in recommending that the plan proceed to referendum. As such he concluded that the Winslow Neighbourhood Plan is lawful.

Further information can be found here: <http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/winslow-neighbourhood-plan/>

c) Billingshurst Neighbourhood Plan

In October 2014 Billingshurst Parish Council deferred its decision on whether or not to produce a neighbourhood plan until further progress is made on the district's local plan.

Councillors at Billingshurst Parish Council broadly expressed support for the creation of a neighbourhood plan but concluded the area's local plan would first need to progress further. It was decided that the Parish Council would defer their decision until after the inspector's report into the Horsham District Planning Framework. Councillors considered that time would have been wasted on preparing a neighbourhood plan if the district planning framework does not go through.

Further information can be found here:
<http://www.billingshurst.gov.uk/Billingshurst-Parish-Council/UserFiles/Files/MINUTES%20OF%20MAIN%20COUNCIL%20MEETING%20-%202014%20OCTOBER%202014%20DRAFT.pdf>

Strategic Environment Assessment²

The Planning Practice Guidance (issued in March 2014 and updated in February 2015) provides the following guidance.

Does a neighbourhood plan require a sustainability appraisal?

There is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal as set out in section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. However, a qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or order will contribute to achieving sustainable development. A sustainability appraisal may be a useful approach for doing this and the guidance on sustainability appraisal of Local Plans should be referred to.

Does a neighbourhood plan require a strategic environmental assessment?

In some limited circumstances, where a [neighbourhood plan](#) is likely to have significant environmental effects, it may require a strategic environmental assessment. Draft neighbourhood plan proposals should be assessed to determine whether the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects. This process is commonly referred to as a “screening” assessment and the requirements are set out in regulation 9 of the [Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004](#).

If likely significant environmental effects are identified, an environmental report must be prepared in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of regulation 12 of those Regulations.

One of the basic conditions that will be tested by the [independent examiner](#) is whether the making of the neighbourhood plan is [compatible with European Union obligations](#) (including under the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive).

How do you know if a draft neighbourhood plan might have significant environmental effects?

To decide whether a draft [neighbourhood plan](#) might have significant environmental effects, it must be assessed (screened) at an early stage of the plan’s preparation according to the requirements set out in regulation 9 of the [Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004](#). These include a requirement to consult the [environmental assessment consultation bodies](#).

² Planning Practice Guidance > Guidance Strategic > environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal > Sustainability appraisal requirements for neighbourhood plans
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal/sustainability-appraisal-requirements-for-neighbourhood-plans/>

Each consultation body will be able to advise on particular topics relevant to its specific area of expertise and responsibility, and the specific information that it holds.

Where it is determined that the plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects (and, accordingly, does not require an environmental assessment), a statement of reasons for the determination should be prepared. A copy of the statement must be submitted with the neighbourhood plan proposal and made available to the independent examiner.

The local planning authority, as part of its duty to advise or assist, should consider putting in place processes to determine whether the proposed neighbourhood plan will require a strategic environmental assessment. The qualifying body should work with the local planning authority to be sure that the authority has the information it needs.

*See Planning Practice Guidance for further SEA advice:
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal/sustainability-appraisal-requirements-for-neighbourhood-plans/>*

The Slaugham Parish Neighbourhood Plan provides a good case study on the strategic environment assessment (SEA) requirements in respect of a neighbourhood plan as discussed below. Other neighbourhood plans have allocated sites as part of the neighbourhood plan e.g. Thame. In fact the Inspector for the South Oxfordshire Local Plan specifically held off allocations for Thame pending the neighbourhood plan.

a) Slaugham Parish Neighbourhood Plan, Mid Sussex

The examination of the Neighbourhood Plan took place by way of a hearing on 4 November 2013. Mid Sussex District Council withdrew their draft local plan from examination in the light of advice from the inspector following a hearing on 12 November 2013 that the Council had not met its duty to cooperate.

The examiner for the neighbourhood plan concluded in her report (issued in January 2014) that the Slaugham Parish Neighbourhood Plan in Mid Sussex should not proceed to a local referendum because it was not compatible with the requirements of European Union obligations insofar as the strategic environment assessment (SEA) submitted as part of the document was not satisfactory in a number of respects. She also found that whilst the Neighbourhood Plan recognises the need for new housing development, the target it sets for the Plan period is not based on sufficiently robust evidence. This resulted in three site allocations that are not necessarily deliverable and have not been sufficiently justified given the weight of the NPPF to the protection of landscape and scenic beauty.

Mid Sussex District Council and Natural England were both happy with the plan's SEA, however the examiner concluded that the Plan was not compatible with the requirements of the European Union obligations insofar that a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required. The SEA is a legal requirement and one

which the Examiner cannot recommend modifications to, and as such it was concluded that the Plan should not proceed to a referendum.

The Examiner concluded that the 'State of the Parish' report approved by the Council as the SEA scoping report did not have elements of a typical Stage A and did not equate to a scoping report. It was also considered that it has not been subject to the necessary consultation. The examiner concluded that as the neighbourhood plan allocated sites there should be consideration of reasonable alternatives. There was little information to demonstrate how reasonable alternatives were identified, how they were assessed and compared or why the chosen sites were selected. Instead the SEA relied on the use of some of the environmental criteria from a district level draft Sustainability Appraisal prepared in conjunction with the emerging District Local Plan. Those criteria therefore had not been tested as they form part of a suite of emerging documents at District Level. The examiner also considered that the District level criteria may not be detailed or site specific enough for use at the scale of the neighbourhood level or sufficient in themselves.

The Environmental Report (Stage C) did not adequately identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the policies and of the reasonable alternatives. Finally the plan also lacked a non-technical summary which is required.

Mid Sussex District Council formally accepted the recommendations of the examination and as such the Plan did not progress to referendum. Work on the Neighbourhood Plan has since begun again.

Further information can be found here:
<http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/8952.htm>

b) Thame Neighbourhood Plan, South Oxfordshire

The South Oxfordshire Core Strategy was adopted in December 2012. The Thame Neighbourhood Plan was made part of the South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) development plan in July 2013 following the positive outcome of the referendum in May 2013. The neighbourhood plan allocates sites for 775 homes, three hectares of new employment land and up to 5,700 square metres of new retail within the town centre up until 2027.

In early 2012, Thame Town Council and SODC had differing views on the future of Thame and these differences came to a head at the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy examination in public (EIP) in summer 2012. SODC's emerging Core Strategy proposed an allocation of 600 homes at a single urban extension to the north west of Thame. TTC argued that it should be for a neighbourhood plan to ascertain where development should be located. The Inspector agreed, and while finding the Core Strategy sound overall, removed the proposed land allocation at Thame, deferring this decision instead to the Thame neighbourhood plan.

Further information can be found here:
<http://www.pas.gov.uk/documents/332612/0/Thame+case+study/2e628cc5-6b6f-4769-a45b-0b403902ce1e>

The ability of Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites³

The Planning Practice Guidance (issued in March 2014) provides the following guidance.

Can a neighbourhood plan allocate sites for development?

A neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development. A qualifying body should carry out an appraisal of options and an assessment of individual sites against clearly identified criteria.

What if a local planning authority is also intending to allocate sites in the same neighbourhood area?

If a local planning authority is also intending to allocate sites in the same neighbourhood area the local planning authority should avoid duplicating planning processes that will apply to the neighbourhood area. It should work constructively with a qualifying body to enable a neighbourhood plan to make timely progress. A local planning authority should share evidence with those preparing the neighbourhood plan, in order for example, that every effort can be made to meet identified local need through the neighbourhood planning process.

Can a neighbourhood plan allocate additional or alternative sites to those in a Local Plan?

A neighbourhood plan can allocate additional sites to those in a Local Plan where this is supported by evidence to demonstrate need above that identified in the Local Plan.

A neighbourhood plan can propose allocating alternative sites to those in a Local Plan, but a qualifying body should discuss with the local planning authority why it considers the Local Plan allocations no longer appropriate.

The resulting draft neighbourhood plan must meet the basic conditions if it is to proceed. National planning policy states that it should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan, plan positively to support local development and should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. Nor should it be used to constrain the delivery of a strategic site allocated for development in the Local Plan.

Should there be a conflict between a policy in a neighbourhood plan and a policy in a Local Plan, section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan.

The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan provides a recent case study of the where the ability of neighbourhood plans to allocate sites was tested.

a) Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan

³ Planning Practice Guidance > Guidance > Neighbourhood Planning >Preparing a neighbourhood plan or Order
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/preparing-a-neighbourhood-plan-or-order/>

An application was made to the High Court of Justice on 2 July 2014 by Larkfleet Homes Ltd seeking a judicial review of Rutland County Council's decision to allow the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to referendum.

Larkfleet Homes Ltd are seeking to develop four hectares of land in Rutland which was not proposed for allocation within the plan. They asserted that under section 17(7)(za) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and in accordance with regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, a site allocation policy document could only be prepared as a local development plan document by the local planning authority.

They also claimed that paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework also precluded neighbourhood plans from allocating land. In response, the council stated that the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 impose no restrictions on what can be contained within a neighbourhood plan.

Mr Justice Collins noted that government planning practice guidance states that neighbourhood plans can allocate sites for development (see green box above) and the government clearly placed significant weight on local communities' ability to exercise power over where new housing, shops and offices should be built. While conceding that parts of the 2012 regulations were poorly drafted, he held that it would be surprising if neighbourhood plans could not be used to allocate land despite not being prepared by local planning authorities. The application was dismissed on 8 December 2014. An application by Larkfleet Homes Ltd to seek permission to appeal against this decision was dismissed on 15 December 2014.

Further information can be found here:

http://www.rutland.gov.uk/local_plan/neighbourhood_planning/uppingham.aspx

Role of emerging Neighbourhood Plans in decision making

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan are two examples of emerging neighbourhood plans being given significant weight in decision making.

a) Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan

Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government Eric Pickles refused outline planning permission for a 120-home development in an area with a significant shortfall in its supply of housing land, after applying "significant weight" to the fact that the development was contrary to policies in the emerging Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.

Pickles' decision was at odds with the opinion of a planning inspector, who recommended the proposals for approval, giving "limited weight" to policies in the emerging plan. When the planning inspector's inquiry was held, preparation of the plan had been in its early stages, Pickles noted, whereas by the time the Secretary of State came to make his decision it had already been submitted for examination and thus merited more weight in the planning balance.

In April 2012, developer Woodcock Holdings Limited applied to Mid-Sussex District Council for outline permission to build 120 homes. The Council refused permission,

citing the impact of the proposed development on a neighbouring Grade II-listed building and concerns about drainage, transport and infrastructure issues. The developer appealed and the appeal was recovered by the Secretary of State for determination. Following an appeal inquiry, planning inspector Jennifer Vyse recommended in January 2014 that the appeal be allowed and planning permission be granted. While the emerging neighbourhood plan allocated the site for only 30 to 40 homes, and did not permit development until existing drainage infrastructure issues had been resolved, the inspector found that "relatively limited weight can be given to the plan, since its adoption process still has quite a way to go, and it could be that policies change along the way."

Disagreeing with the inspector's recommendation, Pickles said in his decision letter on 4 September 2014 that, having been submitted for examination in May, the emerging neighbourhood plan could now be given more weight than when it was considered at the appeal inquiry. Although he agreed with the inspector that the plan "should not promote less development than is required to meet the housing needs of the area", Pickles noted that there were currently no up-to-date housing figures against which the neighbourhood plan could be tested.

The Secretary of State gave significant weight to the fact that the emerging plan identified housing allocations elsewhere within the plan area and that the Council had yet to complete an up-to-date objectively assessed housing needs analysis against which to measure the overall neighbourhood plan proposals.

Pickles agreed with the inspector that the appeal site was "acceptable in terms of its locational characteristics and economic growth and, in principle, in boosting significantly the supply of housing." However, dismissing the appeal, he decided that the planning balance weighed in favour of the policies in the emerging neighbourhood plan and that, although it might be decided later in the examination process that more land might be required to be allocated under the neighbourhood plan, "it would be inappropriate to prejudice that at this stage".

Further information can be found here: http://www.hurstpierpoint-pc.org.uk/neighbourhood_plan.asp

b) Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan

In September 2014 Eric Pickles overruled an inspector and blocked proposals for 77 new homes in Wiltshire because they clash with a draft neighbourhood plan about to begin examination. The minister refused permission for new homes on greenfield land in Malmesbury, Wiltshire, despite the local authority's lack of a five-year housing land supply.

Developer White Lion Land had appealed after its plans for new homes off Park Road, Malmesbury, were refused by Wiltshire Council in June 2013 on the basis that approval would prejudice emerging local and neighbourhood plans.

The draft Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan proposes 270 new homes up to 2026. However this did not include the allocation of housing at the Park Road site. The appeal site was towards the bottom of the list of 25 sites for housing during the neighbourhood plan assessment.

Following an appeal inquiry in April, inspector John Wilde recommended that the appeal be allowed, attaching "significant weight" to the fact the council could only demonstrate a 4.1 year housing land supply. However Eric Pickles stated in his decision that he "gives significant weight to the opportunity which the neighbourhood plan process gives local people to ensure they get the right types of development for their community while also planning positively to support strategic development needs". Eric Pickles believes that "releasing the appeal site for housing now could result in a significant and demonstrable adverse impact on the outcomes of both the [core strategy] and the [neighbourhood plan]".

While Eric Pickles has "regard" to the council's inadequate housing land supply, "he concludes that the immediate benefits of releasing the appeal site as a contribution to meeting overall housing demand in the wider area are insufficient to justify the release of this site so soon before the examination of the [neighbourhood plan] proposals is complete and there has been an opportunity to test them by means of the referendum".

The Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan has since passed a successful referendum held on 27 November 2014 with 90% of the votes in favour.

Further information can be found here: <http://www.malmesburyneighbourhood.com/>

Made Plans

At the end of January 2015 some 33 neighbourhood plans had been made. Links to a selection of these can be found below:

Broughton Astley, Harborough – 20 January 2014

<http://broughtonastley.leicestershireparishcouncils.org/the-big-plan-for-broughton-astle.html>

Cringleford, South Norfolk – 24 February 2014

<http://www.cringelfordparishcouncil.gov.uk/neighbourhood.php>

Norland, Kensington and Chelsea – 27 February 2014

<http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningandconservation/neighbourhoodplanning/norlandneighbourhoodplan.aspx>

Arundel, Barnham & Eastergate, Bersted, Felpham, Littlehampton and Yapton, Arun District Council - April to November 2014

<http://www.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=MADEPLANS>

Bembridge, Isle of Wight – 28 July 2014

<http://www.iwight.com/Residents/Environment-Planning-and-Waste/Planning-Policy-new/Neighbourhood-Planning/Bembridge-Neighbourhood-Development-Plan>

Woburn Sands, Milton Keynes – 16 July 2014

<http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/woburn-sands-neighbourhood-plan>

Much Wenlock, Shropshire – 17 July 2014

<http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/much-wenlock-neighbourhood-plan/>

Winsford, Cheshire West and Chester – 19 November 2014

http://www.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/your_council/policies_and_performance/council_plans_and_strategies/planning_policy/neighbourhood_planning/winsford_neighbourhood_plan.aspx

Tettenhall and Healthfield Park, Wolverhampton – 17 September 2014

<http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning>