

## STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Date: 16 August 2018

**To: Mark James, Senior Regeneration Officer**

Dear Mr James

### **Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Examination**

Thank you for your response to my initial questions and comments. There are a few matters upon which I require further clarification. The paragraph numbers are as my initial questions and comments.

13 - In terms of the Duty to Cooperate and the position in Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme, I assume that neither Council asked Staffordshire Moorlands to help meet their combined development needs of 1390 dwellings per annum. In this respect I also assume that Stoke-on-Trent does not expect to have a shortfall. Finally I assume that the joint local plan would not be submitted for examination until after 24 January 2019. Please confirm that my understanding is correct.

The signed Statement of Common Ground (Stafford Council) should be added to the Examination Website.

21 – There will also be a need to update the policies maps to reflect the clarification on 'washed over' villages and those with settlement boundaries.

30 – I am still not convinced about the Council's approach on dealing with the backlog. This will be discussed at the hearings. Put simply if the base date was 2016 what would the dpa and overall requirement be e.g. would it be 320 dpa and 4800 dwellings?

40 – Any slippage would not be added to the overall requirement but would form part of the housing land supply contained within Policy SS4. If 10% slippage allowance was built in then there would need to be provision for an additional 385 dwellings. It would seem that the only way that this could be achieved would be by additional allocations.

50 – I am still not clear from the response whether optional standards are to be applied. Your response suggests that the evidence is there and viability has been taken into account but that such a requirement would be too onerous. The MMs should make the approach clear.

87 – I still consider that it would be preferable for Policy SD5 to refer to discharge to the public sewer as a last resort.

98 – Qualifying development would presumably be 11 dwellings or more in accordance with the PPG.

I look forward to a response on these matters as soon as possible to allow completion of the Matters, Issues and Questions for the examination. In this respect a response by 22 August would be very helpful.

Yours sincerely

*Mark Dakeyne*

INSPECTOR

Inspector: Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI