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**Preamble**

This document is issued by the Tettenhall Community Forum as a Neighbourhood Plan response and Future Policy Guidance document for Tettenhall, in response to stage 1 of the Wolverhampton City Council (WCC) Local Plan Consultation. It will remain at consultative status for the purposes of neighbourhood planning for the Tettenhall District, and for further development and consultation by the residents and businesses within that District, and for consultative response to WCC.

The document will be refreshed during stage 2 of the consultation, by the Tettenhall District neighbourhood planning body and community forum, at which it shall be issued as the Tettenhall District Preferred Options document, for use in final consultation and for amendment or required updates to the 2014 Neighbourhood Plan.

This document was produced in consultation with members of the Tettenhall Community Forum, who provided their input during analysis of the stage 1 consultation upto 10th April, 2024. It is currently expected that the stage 2 consultation will commence in December 2024, for which this document and further analysis will be necessary by Tettenhall Community Forum and the District neighbourhood planning body, utilising further evidence necessary in production of the stage 2 plan, during September – November 2024. An extension of timescale for stage 2 consultation to equal 12 weeks has been requested by this consultation response.

**Introduction**

The Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) 2014-2026 (Our Place Our Plan) contains planning policies prepared by the Tettenhall District Community Council (TDCC) and adopted by Wolverhampton City Council (WCC) in 2014. These policies and principles contained within remain valid post 2026 until either a revised and updated Neighbourhood Plan is prepared and adopted by WCC, or local, or area planning documentation are brought into force, from which time their more recent publication date means they carry greater legal weight than the TNP.

Where WCC indicate that they do not expect anything in the Local Plan 2024 to override TNP policies, as of stage 1 consultation (Issues & Preferred Options), there is still a risk within stage 2 (Publication Plan), that planning policies may be implemented which require further consultation with the Tettenhall Community Forum (TCF), and may require the Neighbourhood Plan from its 2024 issue date, to be updated with new plans and policies bought into force alongside the WCC Local Plan by 2025.

**Scope**

TNP policy TNP7 states that the relevant Neighbourhood Planning Forum shall be consulted directly before any changes affecting those policies come into force. Since the neighbourhood planning forum for Tettenhall is being re-registered a review has been conducted of the current scope of the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan 2014, performed by the TDCT steering group and Tettenhall Community Forum (residents consultation body). This was conducted to advise of future direction, review the suitability of current policies from 2024, and to assess an impact analysis of imminent WCC Local Plan implementation and its policies from 2024.

**This planning response is issued in order to:**

* **Respond to the specific scope of the stage 1 consultation against regulation 18 to 10 Apr 2024.**
* **Provide future Neighbourhood Plan Policy Guidelines to scope implementation of the stage 2 Publication Plan.**
* **Provide a guidance framework to inform the requirements of the “BIG ISSUES” and key strategic plans (where the Black Country Core Strategy and Area Action Plans are replaced)**
* **Promote early view of the future direction and amended policies sought for Tettenhall District NP policies.**

**Summary Leaflet - Big Issues**

The Local Plan consultation Summary Leaflet identifies the following “Big Issues”:

* Climate Change
* A Growing & Changing Population (10% housing growth)
* Health & Wellbeing
* Economic Recovery & Growth
* Town Centres & Shopping
* Transport & Connectivity
* Natural & Built Environment
* Supporting Infrastructure

**Summary Leaflet - Preferred Option**

The Local Plan consultation Summary Leaflet has identified a “Preferred Option”, including “Spatial Allocations” in order to meet the requirements to “identify enough land to meet our future employment needs and provide sufficient homes for new households”.

**The summary document includes a description of the preferred option as “Urban and Brownfield First”, however there is no information enclosed concerning the other options. Question B of this summary can only be answered in principle and further response is necessary from the main document *– Do you agree with the preferred spatial option for the Wolverhampton Local Plan ?***

The preferred option characteristics are:

• Protect and retain all of our valuable Green Belt

• Protect and enhance our natural and historic environment

• Deliver 10,300 new homes by 2042 on 190 hectares (ha) of land (the equivalent of 285 football pitches), which will continue current rates of housing delivery across the City to meet local needs. Most of this land already has planning permission or is allocated in existing Plans.

• Make most efficient use of land and boost regeneration by locating 44% of new homes in Wolverhampton City Centre and 97% on brownfield land, and building at a high average density of 55 homes per ha (compared to 40 homes per ha on a normal housing estate).

• Support the recovery and growth of the economy, particularly in high quality manufacturing, and identify 63 ha of land (equivalent to 95 football pitches) for the employment development that Wolverhampton needs.

• In light of the challenges facing our high streets, particularly vacant properties, help to rejuvenate and diversify our centres as places to live, work, shop and visit.

• Minimise the amount of waste generated across all sectors and increase the re-use, recycling, and recovery rates of waste material.

• Ensure enough physical, social and environmental infrastructure (such as transport and green space) is delivered to meet identified needs and support growth

**Summary Leaflet - Spatial Option**

The spatial option proposed in order to deliver the obligation of 10,300 new homes proposes a distribution across area types as:

* 22% Regeneration Areas
* 33% Existing Residential Areas
* 44% City Centre

New employment development is specified as 63ha, 100% of which would be in regeneration areas around town centres and along transport corridors.

**The WCC Local Plan, whilst including a map of spatial options does not specify the definition of transport corridors, this should be explicitly stated as to what constitutes a transport corridor, with explicit description of the routes concerned, and whether “local arterial routes” are included in this definition or not.**

**Summary Leaflet - Green Belt Protection**

The Preferred Option intends to completely protect Wolverhampton’s Green Belt, meaning it is NOT proposed to develop any green belt sites, which includes:

• Land at Bushbury

• Land at Fallings Park

• Former Wolverhampton Environment Centre (WEC), Westacre Crescent

• The ‘Seven Cornfields’ (land at Pennwood Farm)

• Grapes Pool (Moseley Road Open Space)

• Former St Luke’s Junior School, Goldthorn Road

• Open Space at Wrenbury Drive, The Lunt (Alexander Metals

**TNP Planning Policies Re-Adoption**

The local plan does not however, specify that land allocated within the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan as either green belt, protected land, or conservation areas, nor specific housing development character shall also be excluded.

**Whilst it is not expected that this omission has any injurious proponent, due to the existence of specific planning policies within the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan, this response will consider their requirements for substantial and comprehensive re-adoption within the Wolverhampton Local Plan.**

**Summary Leaflet - Areas Of Developmental Restriction and Priorities For Conservation and Enhancement**

The local plan states “areas of the City where development will be restricted, and areas of environmental and historic importance which will be priorities for conservation and enhancement. The Plan will also include a set of ‘policies’ – the rules which are used to determine planning applications for a wide range of development proposals.”

**Whilst the preferred spatial option sites are explicitly listed, the summary document does not also state the explicit list of spatial options for development restriction, and the priorities for conservation and enhancement. Nor does it refer to guidelines for policies which will determine planning application. These should be explicitly stated and confirmation obtained that if there is a difference to TNP planning guidelines that the TNP policies (and future policy guidelines stated in this document) will be substantially and comprehensively adhered to. Any variations to this shall require a specific consultation with the neighbourhood planning body (TDCT and TCF) before any documentation is released under stage 2.**

**Neighbourhood Plan Updates**

The Local Plan states that for Tettenhall and Heathfield Park – “These Neighbourhood Plans can only be updated by the local community and are not part of the Wolverhampton Local Plan work. **“**

**Whilst the new Neighbourhood Plans must be updated by the neighbourhood planning body concerned, it is essential that the scope of the Local Plan, its policies and principles ARE part of the Local Plan such that all existing planning policies are substantially and comprehensively adopted. This includes relevant infrastructure and area planning for employment and housing where contributions to and solutions for infrastructure problems within the Neighbourhood Plan area (ie Rock Junction) are considered from the local plan, planning policies, traffic surveys and infrastructure contribution to sustain and improve infrastructure and traffic solutions with the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan area. Reduction of requirements for Civil Infrastructure Levies stated in proposed changes to Policy EMP5 are injurious to the needs to maintain effective local infrastructure.**

**Summary Leaflet - Development Shortfall**

The local plan states that there will be a development shortfall of 11,400 homes and 53ha of Employment Land, for which WCC are legally required to: “ask neighbouring Councils, such as South Staffordshire, Lichfield and Shropshire, to provide more housing and employment land in their area to help meet the Wolverhampton shortfalls and such discussions are ongoing”

**The proposed option cannot be thoroughly assessed without considering what sub options there are for higher density in city centre urban areas, and how development shortfall will be met characteristically. Joining up villages in South Staffordshire to make their borders contiguous with that of suburban and semi-rural North and West Wolverhampton is not an acceptable approach as this would be injurious to the character and heritage of this area, specifically the character and heritage of Tettenhall District as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan.**

**Tettenhall TNP Future Policy Guidelines**

The TCF and Steering Group have considered the following issues as the main preferred options, additional to existing TNP plan and policies to implement and update in the Neighbourhood Plan:

**District Recognition**

Councillor Simpkins has stated that Tettenhall, Wednesfield and Bilston should be recognised as Districts for their own direction setting.

**Green Belt & Other Spaces**

The continued importance of defending every inch of green space in the neighbourhood against any and all attempted incursions, due to the chronic shortage of land in the neighbourhood.  Strengthening the position to enable a watching brief on land which may not yet be categorised as green spaces; such as that attached to commercial or business premises eg Schools Community Church Henwood Road, large gardens (Stockwell House) and land for sale opposite The Mermaid; was also recommended.

**Children’s Community Facilities**

Play areas for children needs more focus.  Existing facilities need policy decisions to protect and enhance their attractiveness.  For example damage caused by vandalism should be restored as a matter of policy and tackled via the Local Community Policing Policy.  There is room for additional facilities eg in the grounds of the Schools Community Church in Henwood Road and further investment in facilities for children to enjoy and learn in our GREEN SPACES but without detriment to their preservation.

**Community Facilities & Infrastructure**

The TDCT should lead on proposing development and implementation of solutions and strategies to improve community facilities, providing increased use and satisfaction, improved amenity, wellbeing and availability of services.

**Planning**

Recent developments, for example the McCarthy and Stone developments, have provoked strong reactions from residents who have had various levels of success challenging the height, style and intrusion of the development on adjacent properties.  The planning aspect would benefit from a much stronger wording on height, style and density.

**Enforcement of Planning Conditions**

The plan should facilitate the enforcement of planning conditions during developments.  Parking restrictions for contractors were not enforced during the development of Clock Gardens, Tree Preservation Orders were ignored at the development at the bottom of Malthouse Lane, wall preservation at Stockwell House has been ignored.  All of these failures of enforcement occurred during the current plan so we should establish better influence and control regarding enforcement in the next plan.

**Technology**

The benefits of current and new technologies and social media should receive more emphasis in the plan as an overarching policy in supporting all the other policies and operation of the Forum and its administration.

**Transport**

There is an inability to influence the catalysts of a dramatic explosion in traffic volumes created by new housing and other developments outside the area.  WCC is obliged to export some of its housing targets and development targets outside its area because of lack of available land.  However, the inevitable consequence of that is a surge of traffic from these developments through the neighbourhood, mostly heading beyond Wolverhampton rather than into Wolverhampton. Oversight of civil infrastructure contributions for Ward Solutions are required.

**Housing**

Changes to the current plan are required which state protections to heritage and views, but do not state density objectives. These may be at odds with Local Plan objectives.

**Road Safety**

Dissatisfaction within the District of police enforcement and appropriate share of spend on road calming measures, compared to other wards.

**Licencing Policies & Planning Applications**

There shall be an overall policy and right to be consulted on matters of licencing, reviews and planning applications, where the District feel that style of its neighbourhood may be affected, such as through excessive high street licenced premises, or schools now operating as licenced premises for venue hire.

**Adoption Of Tettenhall Preferred Options**

**In addition to the “Big Issues”, the WCC Local Plan must;**

* **Refer to and adopt the preferred policies from the Tettenhall District Preferred Options document.**
* **Develop policies in compliance with the future policy guidelines in the Tettenhall preferred options document, and the policies contained within Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan 2014.**
* **State the substantial and comprehensive re-adoption of all TNP 2014 policies within the Wolverhampton Local Plan.**
* **Provided guided evidence in the main document in stage 2 of the consultation where any changes or alterations are proposed which would not meet with the requirements in the Tettenhall District Preferred Options document.**

**WCC Local Plan Main Document – Vision & Strategic Priorities**

The main document contains further, more detailed information for response on 6 priorities, of which the WLP will be directly relevant to the following:

* healthy, inclusive communities
* good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods
* more local people into good jobs and training
* thriving economy in all parts of the City

**Responses to the main document questions are contained in Appendix 2.**

**WCC Local Plan Main Document – Preferred Options**

The preferred options proposed in the main document, per each category are as follows:

Growth And Spatial Options i) Housing Growth

***Option H3***

Carry forward existing housing allocations and make new allocations which focus housing growth in urban area, with increased density in accessible locations and structural change in Centres, and export remaining housing need to neighbouring authorities: • Around 9,722\* homes on existing supply in urban area • 61 homes on one new allocation (following discount) • Around 524\* homes from density uplift and structural change in Centres • Around 11,413\* homes exported through Duty to Cooperate

Wolverhampton Land Growth Options

***Option E3***

*Carry forward existing employment allocations and make new employment allocations in locations suitable for employment use and with good transport access, and explore remaining employment land need to neighbouring authorities: • 47.4 ha on existing employment land supply in urban area • 15.3 ha on new allocations • 53.3 ha exported through Duty to Cooperate*

Wolverhampton Spatial Options

***Option G***

*Balanced and Sustainable Growth – Focus development in the central, north and east parts of Wolverhampton, to minimise climate change impacts, make best use of existing infrastructure and support urban regeneration. Key features: increased housing density in the most accessible locations; more housing in Wolverhampton City Centre*

Gypsy & Traveller Pitch Options

***Option G2***

*Make use of existing and potential new sites to deliver new gypsy and traveller pitches up to 2032: • 2 pitches regularised on currently unauthorised site • 12 pitches on existing allocated site • 19 pitches exported through Duty to Cooperate*

**Appendix 1 – Local Plan Summary Leaflet Main Question Responses**

Question A: Do you agree with the “big issues” identified for the Wolverhampton Local Plan to address?

**YES IN PRINCIPLE. However, in addition to the “Big Issues”, the WCC Local Plan should develop policies in compliance with the future policy guidelines in this Tettenhall District Preferred Options document.**

Question B: Do you agree with the Preferred Spatial Option for the Wolverhampton Local Plan?

**YES IN PRINCIPLE. However, further details are provided in Appendix 2 of the Tettenhall District Preferred Options document.**

Question C: Do you agree with the proposed site allocations for the Wolverhampton Local Plan?

**YES IN PRINCIPLE. However, the local plan does not specify that land allocated within the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan as either green belt, protected land, or conservation areas, nor specific housing development character shall also be excluded. Whilst it is not expected that this omission has any injurious proponent, due to the existence of specific planning policies within the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan, this response will consider their requirements for substantial and comprehensive re-adoption within the Wolverhampton Local Plan.**

Question D: Do you agree with the preferred approach to policies in the Wolverhampton Local Plan?

**No. The Preferred Option stated in the Summary Document is ambiguous. Further explicit information is required. The example policies mentioned which will be strengthened are agreed in isolation as acceptable, however the response to Main Document Question 9 states concise consultation response per item, including changes to BCP policies and Evidence & Background Documents.** **Links should be provided for all documentation, where these are missing there is insufficient proof available for the consultee to determine a response.**

Question E: Do you have any other comments to make about the Wolverhampton Local Plan?

**Where WCC indicate that they do not expect anything in the Local Plan 2024 to override TNP policies, as of stage 1 consultation (Issues & Preferred Options), there is still a risk within stage 2 (Publication Plan), that planning policies may be implemented which require further consultation with the Tettenhall Community Forum (TCF), and may require the Neighbourhood Plan from its 2024 issue date, to be updated with new plans and policies bought into force alongside the WCC Local Plan by 2025.**

**It is currently expected that the stage 2 consultation will commence in December 2024, for which this Tettenhall District Preferred Option Document and further analysis will be necessary by Tettenhall Community Forum and the District neighbourhood planning body, utilising further evidence necessary in production of the stage 2 plan, during September – November 2024. An extension of timescale for stage 2 consultation to equal 12 weeks has been requested by this consultation response.**

**The Local Plan states that for Tettenhall and Heathfield Park – “These Neighbourhood Plans can only be updated by the local community and are not part of the Wolverhampton Local Plan work. “**

**Whilst the new Neighbourhood Plans must be updated by the neighbourhood planning body concerned, it is essential that the scope of the Local Plan, its policies and principles ARE part of the Local Plan such that all existing planning policies are substantially and comprehensively adopted.**

**Appendix 2 – Main Document Big Issues & Proposed Approach Responses**

1. Do you agree with the proposed scope of the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 1)   
**NO. The Timescale of 6 weeks over the Christmas and New Year holiday period is insufficient. Due to the need for analysis against a Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan, possible revisions to policies and adoption of future policy guidelines, a period of 12 weeks is more suitable, or 14 weeks if the holiday period is included.**

2. Do you agree with the “big issues” identified for the Wolverhampton Local Plan to address? (please see sections 2 & 3)   
**NO. The TNP future preferred policies state, additional to the Local Plan issues, the following items, which are not covered; District Recognition (incl heritage), Children’s Community Facilities, Community Facilities & Infrastructure, Technology (incl disruptive nascent clusters), Road Safety,**

**The TCF does accept with the 7 WMCA conditions of; New powers over economic development, Transport investment, Housing and land investment, Pioneering new approaches to regeneration, Developing skills, Working with investors, Committing to net zero by 2041.**

**However, it does NOT agree where new powers over economic development are suggested, which should remain with consultation between WCC Local Plan and TNP Neighbourhood Plan, where developments concern the district covered by the Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan – Regis and Wightwick wards.**

**The TCF does accept the 6 key priorities of; Strong families where children grow up well and achieve their full potential, Fulfilled lives for all with quality care for those that need it, Healthy, inclusive communities, Good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods, More local people into good jobs and training, Thriving economy in all parts of the city.**

**However, it does not agree with the WMCA plan for growth derived vision of bi-sector industrial strategy of legacy clusters as; materials/metals, service industry. The Wolverhampton employment area stock and facilities for Small Trade & Medium Scale Enterprise (ST/MSE) is very poor and the environment makes for limited appeal for investment and occupation. Concentrating on a single or two market economy is a poor approach, which will not support needs for employment growth or make Wolverhampton attractive to business or new residents. The Wolverhampton local plan should provide a vision for multiple sector employment areas, and consider its competitive strategy to regenerate, build a new economy which does not rely solely on limited markets or the need to move all employment areas to the periphery due to the nature of transport issues related to the metals and materials industry. Facilities suitable for ST/MSE should be prioritised by considering relative attractiveness of near-by economic areas, their greater attractiveness to live/work and options which employers have in the marketplace for relocation, through a more detailed competitive analysis of the facts and evidence of where economic growth has moved to.**

3. Do you agree that the evidence and background documents listed in Table 1 are sufficient to support the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 4)

**NO. Links should be provided for all documentation, where these are missing there is insufficient proof available for the consultee to determine a response. Some documents refer to a future To-Be state “To be updated”. These documents must be updated prior to stage 2 consultation, 12 weeks before the commencement of stage 2 consultation in order for relevant proof to be validated and verified.**

4. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the Vision and Strategic Priorities for the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 5 A)

**YES.**

5. Do you agree with the Preferred Housing Growth Option (H3) for the Wolverhampton Local Plan and the proposed apportionment approach to housing contributions from neighbouring authorities? (please see section 5 B (i))

**NO. The local plan implies a density uplift in all planning areas. The Tettenhall Neighbourhood Plan and Future Policy Guidelines require that all developments reflect the heritage and character of the area, views are protected, height of development is restricted to existing aspects, and that future developments do not increase density over the existing aspect in the relevant neighbourhoods for Tettenhall District. Outsource of housing growth to South Staffordshire should not be allowed as this will join up distinct neighbourhoods, injurious to the heritage and character of Tettenhall District. Infrastructure contribution to resolve transport capacity problems (TNP12) should be included in the WCC Local Plan.**

6. Do you agree with the Preferred Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Option (G2) for the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 5 B (ii))

**NO. Pitches exported cannot be agreed to as the location must be specified.**

7. Do you agree with the Preferred Employment Land Growth Option (E3) for the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 5 B (iii))

**NO. Specific options should be stated considering where clusters are proposed in order to inform this policy. Employment strategy should not ‘industrialise’ the suburbs and surrounding villages and neighbourhoods of South Staffordshire.**

8. Do you agree with the Preferred Spatial Option (G – Balanced and Sustainable Growth) for the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 5 B (iv))

**NO. The spatial option should concentrate on existing employment areas in the central and east urban areas, removing north Wolverhampton to prevent the industrialisation of residential suburbs and the history and character of the area. The growth vision only assumes a bi-sector focus on metal/materials and service industry and should consider a more competitive strategy considering employment for multiple industries and market sectors outside of existing cluster characteristics. Southern employment areas of Wolverhampton and those areas with good infrastructure transport links (such as M6 and Black Country Highway) should be prioritised, along with further infrastructure and transport links investment for commercial and commuting purposes, to establish a competitive advantage for Wolverhampton in comparison to other Backcountry areas where better infrastructure exists. Specifically, recent development on the Blackcountry Highway, and proximity to main transport links around M6, M5 and railways has provided a competitive advantage to other Blackcountry areas, which has reduced the appeal of Wolverhampton over time.**

9. Do you agree with the preferred approach to policies in the Wolverhampton Local Plan (that the policies and Policies Map designations should repeat those in the Draft Black Country Plan (2021), subject to the amendments set out in Appendix 2 *[of the WCC Local Plan Main Document]* and summarised in section 5 C)? Please tell us which policies you are referring to.

**Approval to Section 5.36/Policies CSP1-3, GB1 – It is agreed that green belt should be protected and NOT reviewed. References to release of green belt for housing should be removed in Policies CSP1-3.**

**Objection to Policy EMP5.** ***Change to part 3 of Policy to refer to planning obligations being negotiated with applicants rather than required****.* **It is entirely appropriate that WCC should require contribution, secured through planning obligation or the CIL Charging Schedule, and reduction of power to remove a mandatory requirement will reduce the quality of infrastructure in the Local Plan area.**

*EMP5.3 Currently States: In respect of the planning applications for new employment generating development the Black Country authorities may require applicants to make financial or other contributions, secured through planning obligations or the CIL Charging Schedule.*

**Objection to Policy TRAN1. *Add reference, in introductory text and justification, to production of a transport evidence base for the land use allocations.* TRAN1 and this policy, or a derived WCC Local Plan Policy should state that land use allocations should be considered against Neighbourhood Plan policies, where they exist, and evidence of amenity use, or loss thereof, in addition to [just] transport evidence.**

10. Do you agree with the proposed site allocations for the Wolverhampton Local Plan? (please see section 5 D – housing, gypsy & traveller pitch, employment development, waste and minerals; and please tell us which sites you are referring to, using the site references in Table 4 and the Draft Black Country Plan (2021)).

**Section 5D. No Objections.**

**Objection to Gypsy & Traveller Pitches. Pitches exported cannot be agreed to as the location must be specified.**

**Employment Development. Section e. Employment specifies an approach to facilitate the growth and diversification of the economy, and provide a balanced portfolio of sites to meet a variety of business needs, including high technology manufacturing and logistics sectors. This approach is an improvement on the constraints of the growth plan defining only a bi-sector planning approach. Vision and strategy elsewhere in the document should reflect this diversified approach. However, this approach is still limited to a few industries and employment sectors and should incorporate a more comprehensive vision which should include an even greater diversification.**

**Waste and Minerals. No Objections**

11. Do you have any other comments to make about the Wolverhampton Local Plan? This could include any responses to the Issues & Preferred Options Summary Leaflet and/ or other information, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, Interactive Map and supporting evidence. Please state clearly what aspect of the consultation you are referring to (e.g. document/ page/ section/ question/ site reference/ policy area)

**Where WCC indicate that they do not expect anything in the Local Plan 2024 to override TNP policies, as of stage 1 consultation (Issues & Preferred Options), there is still a risk within stage 2 (Publication Plan), that planning policies may be implemented which require further consultation with the Tettenhall Community Forum (TCF), and may require the Neighbourhood Plan from its 2024 issue date, to be updated with new plans and policies bought into force alongside the WCC Local Plan by 2025.**

**It is currently expected that the stage 2 consultation will commence in December 2024, for which this Tettenhall District Preferred Option Document and further analysis will be necessary by Tettenhall Community Forum and the District neighbourhood planning body, utilising further evidence necessary in production of the stage 2 plan, during September – November 2024. An extension of timescale for stage 2 consultation to equal 12 weeks has been requested by this consultation response.**

**The Local Plan states that for Tettenhall and Heathfield Park – “These Neighbourhood Plans can only be updated by the local community and are not part of the Wolverhampton Local Plan work. “**

**Whilst the new Neighbourhood Plans must be updated by the neighbourhood planning body concerned, it is essential that the scope of the Local Plan, its policies and principles ARE part of the Local Plan such that all existing planning policies are substantially and comprehensively adopted.**