

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR THE EXAMINATION AND HEARING SESSIONS

Hearings Commence: Tuesday 9 October 2018

Venue for Sessions: Churnet Room, Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek ST13 6HQ

Inspector: Mark Dakeyne BA(Hons) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Angela Weate
Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek ST13 6HQ

Phone: 07970 143898

Email: programmeofficer@staffordshiremoorlands.gov.uk

Website: https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/examination_library

Preamble: The Matters, Issues and Questions set out below arise from:
(1) the Inspector's initial assessment of the Local Plan against the tests of soundness; and,
(2) the points made by representors that go to soundness.
All references within the document to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) are to the 2012 version.

The Council intend to produce a draft Schedule of potential Main Modifications in advance of the hearings, hopefully to be published at the same time as statements.

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Session 1 – 09.30 Tuesday 9 October 2018

Matter 1

Legal Compliance, Procedural Requirements and the Duty to Cooperate

This matter explores whether the Local Plan (LP) has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements set out in the Planning Act 2004 and the Local Planning Regulations 2012.

There are provisions within the Act and Regulations relating to the Duty to Cooperate (DtC), Sustainability Appraisal (SA), publication and notification requirements and dealing with representations.

The Council has pointed that at each stage of the LP different sites have come forward but that consultation has taken place on the various iterations.

Issues:

1. Compliance with procedural requirements including consultation/participation procedures

1.1 Is there any evidence that the Council has not complied with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) or otherwise not met the minimum requirements for consultation or that consultation and publicity has otherwise been inadequate at various stages of the LP process?

2. Compliance with the DtC, particularly in relation to consideration of housing needs

2.1 Is there evidence that the Council has cooperated effectively with adjoining authorities in considering unmet housing needs and employment land requirements from elsewhere in the Housing Market Area (HMA) and Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA)?

2.2 Are there likely to be any unmet needs from the overlapping Stoke-on-Trent HMA?

The Council confirms that neither Stoke nor Newcastle-under-Lyme Councils have asked Staffordshire Moorlands to help meet their combined development needs of 1390 dwellings per annum (dpa).

2.3 Has the Council cooperated effectively with the Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) in meeting development and infrastructure requirements?

2.4 Are the Statements of Common Ground effective tools to facilitate ongoing engagement with adjoining authorities?

2.5 Is there evidence that the Council has cooperated effectively with Staffordshire County Council (SCC) and other infrastructure providers and technical consultees on relevant issues such as transport, education, waste, minerals and flood risk?

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

3. The SA and its consideration of reasonable alternatives

3.1 Does the SA meet statutory and legal requirements in relation to the assessment of reasonable alternatives?

4. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

4.1 Is there any evidence to contradict the HRA conclusions that the LP either alone or in combination will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of any European sites?

5. The Local Plan timeframe

The Council notes that the Inspector's Report into the Core Strategy (CS) refers to the need for an early review for the period 2016-2031.

5.1 Is the timeframe of the LP appropriate (2016-2031) or should it be extended to provide a 15 year period upon adoption?

5.2 Is the start date of 2016 consistent with the evidence base (see also Matter 3, Issue 1 which will deal with the relationship between the plan period and the housing requirement)?

Main Evidence Base (Submission and Examination Library Documents – SD and EL)

SD.5 – Consultation Statements

SD.6 – SA Reports

SD.7 – HRA

SD.9 – DtC Statements

EL1.001b – Council response to Inspector's preliminary questions

Participants

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC)

Others to be determined

Session 2 – 13.30 Tuesday 9 October 2018

Matter 2

Strategy and Strategic Policies

The matter considers whether the strategy for the distribution of development is justified and whether strategic policies are positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy.

In response to preliminary questions the Council:

- has indicated that it will suggest MMs to provide support for exceptional circumstances in relation to allocations in the Green Belt;
- is prepared to delete Policy SS1a if considered appropriate; and,
- will modify Policies SS2 and SS8 to distinguish between those villages that lie within

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

the Green Belt and those elsewhere.

Specific sites will be discussed during Week 2 of the hearings.

Issues:

1. The spatial distribution of development

1.1 Is the strategy for the distribution of development justified (Policy SS3)?

1.2 Are the changes from the distribution in the CS for Cheadle and the Rural Areas justified?

1.3 Should more growth be targeted to the rural areas, particularly the larger villages, to enhance and maintain their vitality and viability and increase the supply of affordable housing?

1.4 Does the housing allocation at Blythe Bridge (300 dwellings) distort the strategy and the approach to the rural area by proposing a large proportion of dwellings in one place which will primarily serve the needs of the Stoke-on-Trent conurbation (65% of the dwellings to be allocated in the rural area)? Would an alternative approach of distributing allocations over a number of smaller villages be more sustainable?

1.5 Is the level of growth at Biddulph (20%) reflective of its role as a one of the main towns in the District?

1.6 Should the Plan be more prescriptive in providing housing requirements for each settlement?

2. Settlement hierarchy

2.1 Is the settlement hierarchy within Policy SS2 and the position of villages within the hierarchy (Policies SS8 and SS9) justified?

2.2 Should Leekbrook be treated as part of Leek or as a Larger Village within the Settlement Hierarchy rather than as a Smaller Village taking into account the character and accessibility of the settlement?

3. Settlement Boundaries and the Countryside

3.1 Is the approach to settlement boundaries for the larger and smaller villages justified (Policy SS2) particularly the removal of boundaries for the smaller villages?

3.2 Will the removal of settlement boundaries for the smaller villages lead to uncertainty and unsustainable patterns of development?

3.3 Are the policies relating to development within and adjoining settlements justified and consistent with national policy (Policies SS2, SS8, SS9 and H1)?

3.4 Do the policies provide sufficient scope for brownfield development within and close to villages?

3.5. Is the approach to 'limited infill' justified and consistent with national policy, particularly in relation to the larger and smaller villages?

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

3.6 Will the reliance on windfalls in villages through Policies SS2, SS8, SS9 and H1 undermine the ability of development to provide affordable housing and contribute to infrastructure?

3.7 Is Policy SS10 too restrictive in only providing for development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside?

4. Strategic Policies SS1 and SS1a

4.1 Are the development principles within Policy SS1 justified and consistent with national policy?

4.2 Is Policy SS1a necessary in that it largely repeats national policy contained within paragraph 14 of the Framework?

5. Green Belt.

5.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the alteration to Green Belt boundaries? This question is targeted at the in principle approach to the release of Green Belt land within in LP. Specific sites will be dealt with under Matter 8.

5.2 How should the LP be modified to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, assuming that such circumstances have been justified?

5.3 Should more land be released from the Green Belt to provide areas of 'safeguarded land' to meet longer-term development needs?

5.4 Do exceptional circumstances exist to release more Green Belt land around some of the larger villages such as Biddulph Moor, Blythe Bridge, Brown Edge, Cheddleton, Endon and Werrington?

5.5 Are policies SS2, SS8 and SS9 consistent with national Green Belt policy?

5.6 Is it clear which Smaller Villages are to be 'washed over' by Green Belt and which are to be excluded from the Green Belt by retention of a settlement boundary and is the distinction between these villages justified?

Main Evidence Base

SD.13.5 – Policy and Strategy Topic Paper

SD.22.4, 22.6 and 22.7 – Green Belt Review Studies

EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions

Schedule of Main Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Councillor Chris Woods

Others to be determined

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Session 3 – 09.30 Wednesday 10 October 2018

Matter 3

Housing and Employment Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) and Requirements

This matter explores whether the amount of housing and employment land proposed in the LP is appropriate to meet the needs of the District to 2031. The housing OAN is derived from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017 update (SD27.5)

Issues

1. The Housing OAN and Requirement

Higher or Lower?

1.1. Does the evidence base support the requirement for housing of 320 dpa or 6080 dwellings for the LP period within an OAN range of 235 to 330 dpa taking into account demographic and economic factors, market signals and affordable housing need?

1.2 Or should the requirement be higher to support job growth and the delivery of affordable housing e.g. at the top of the range identified in the SHMA – 330 dpa?

1.3 Alternatively should the requirement be lower so that it is ‘aspirational but realistic’ taking into account past delivery rates?

Other Factors

1.4 Does the requirement reflect the failure to deliver housing to meet past ‘targets’?

1.5 Has the need for older persons’ accommodation, including that within C2 communal living been taken into account in the OAN?

1.6 Whilst policies in the 2012 Framework should apply in examining the LP does the new methodology for calculating housing need proposed within the revised Framework have any implications for the OAN?

The LP and housing requirement periods

1.7 Is the discrepancy between the plan period (2016-2031) and the period for the housing requirement within Policy SS3 justified?

1.8 What would be the implications of aligning the housing requirement and the LP period?

2. Phased approach to delivery?

2.1 Is the move away from the phased approach to the delivery of the housing requirement within the CS justified?

3. The Employment OAN

3.1 Does the evidence base support the OAN of 27 ha of employment land?

3.2 Taking into account past delivery rates of employment land e.g. 2.39 ha in the period 2012-17, is the employment land requirement realistic?

4. Alignment between housing and employment requirements

4.1 Is there sufficient alignment between housing and employment in that the

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

employment land requirement is at the top of the range whilst the housing requirement is 10 dpa below the top of the range?

4.2 Assuming that the housing requirement remains at 320 dpa should the employment land requirement be reduced?

Main Evidence Base

SD.13.5 – Policy and Strategy Topic Paper

SD.17 – Employment Land Studies

SD.27 – SHMAs

EL1.001b Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions

EL1.001d Council response to Inspector's follow up questions

Schedule of Main Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 4 – 13.30 Wednesday 10 October 2018

Matter 4

Housing Land Supply

This matter considers how the housing requirement will be met; whether those means of meeting the requirement have been justified and will be effective; and whether the LP will be able to maintain a five year housing land supply.

Information is available to allow the LP to reflect a base date of 31 March 2018. In this respect the Council has agreed to update Policy SS4 and Tables 7.2 and 7.2 within the LP. The Council has also indicated that a Housing Implementation Strategy (HIS) will be prepared

Delivery from individual sites will be considered during Week 2 of the hearings.

Issues

1. Components of Housing Supply

1.1 Is the up to date housing supply position clearly shown in the LP (base date of 31 March 2018)?

1.2 What are the components of the housing supply that will meet the housing requirement?

1.3 Are the components of supply clearly shown within the LP?

1.4 Is the windfall allowance justified by compelling evidence (large site allowance for Leek and Biddulph and small sites allowance for all areas)?

1.5 Is there an over-reliance on windfalls?

1.6 Should there be a slippage/lapse allowance as in the CS? If so what figure

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

would be justified taking into account previous non-implementation rates?

1.7 Is the PDNP allowance of 100 dwellings within the Plan period justified?

1.8 Is the shortfall in supply of housing for Leek in Policy SS4 justified (980 dwellings compared to a requirement of 1015 dwellings)?

1.9 Should there be an allowance for demolitions?

2. The Housing Trajectory and Housing Implementation Strategy (HIS)

2.1 Is the data that supports the Housing Trajectory in Appendix 7 (SD19.2b) based on realistic assumptions?

2.2 Does the HIS (when available) demonstrate that a five year supply can be maintained through the plan period?

2.3. Is the approach to making up any shortfall in delivery over the LP period justified (the Liverpool approach)?

3. Five Year Housing Land Supply

3.1 Is the use of a 20% buffer to calculate the housing land supply position appropriate?

3.2 Generally, are the assumptions about the delivery from commitments and allocations realistic taking into account past completions, for example in relation to Cheadle where development has been slow to take off?

3.3 Are lead in times and build out rates realistic?

3.4 Will there be a five year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption of the LP?

4. The wording of housing supply policies

4.1 Is Policy SS4 as modified clear to the decision maker?

Main Evidence Base

SD.19 – Housing Land Supply Schedules and Housing Trajectory Data

SD.26 - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

SD.33.6 – Cabinet Report – Accelerated Housing Delivery Programme

EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary Questions

Schedule of Main Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 5 – 09.30 Thursday 11 October 2018

Matter 5

Specific Housing Needs and Generic Housing Policies

This matter considers housing mix, affordable housing, gypsy and traveller needs and generic housing policies (Section 8.3 of the LP). In response to preliminary questions:

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

- The Council indicates that it will seek to apply the optional technical standards in relation to space and accessibility but the extent that they will be applied will depend on a number of factors such as the type of housing and viability. Policy H1 and its explanation will be modified to provide clarification;
- Inconsistencies within policies relating to starter homes are to be addressed;
- A revised threshold of 11 dwellings for the provision of affordable housing in towns is proposed;
- Policy H3 Section is to be modified to allow a proportion of market housing (para 54 of the NPPF refers);
- Policy H3 is to be modified to ensure that affordable housing is designed so that it is tenure blind; and,
- Policy H4 is to be modified to make clear the residual requirement for traveller pitches.

Issues

1. Housing Mix (Policy H1)

1.1. Does the requirement for developments to provide for a mix of housing in accordance with the most up-to-date SHMA provide sufficient clarity?

1.2 Are the requirements of Policy H1 in relation to space and accessibility clear?

1.3 Does the wording of Policy H1 allow for sufficient flexibility taking into account viability considerations and differing needs across the District?

2. Affordable Housing (Policy H3)

2.1 Are the requirements for the levels of affordable housing within Policy H3 justified (now proposed as 33% on schemes of 11 dwellings and above in towns and 33% on schemes of 5 dwellings and above elsewhere)?

2.2 In particular is the threshold of '5 dwellings or more' for elsewhere (areas beyond the towns) justified?

2.3 Should a finer grain approach to the amount of provision in different parts of the District be adopted taking into account the findings of the viability study?

2.4 Is the wording of the 2nd part of Policy H3 Section 1) a) likely to undermine the provision of affordable housing?

2.5 Is the tenure split within Policy H3 justified? (60% for rent/40% intermediate or starter homes)

2.6 Does the tenure split provide sufficient flexibility if needs change over the lifetime of the LP?

2.7 Is the modification to Policy H3 Section 2) a) to allow a proportion of market housing (para 54 of the NPPF refers) appropriate?

3. Generic Housing Policies

3.1 Are the other requirements of Policy H1 clear to the decision maker e.g. in relation to

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

starter homes and self-build housing (the Council has indicated that it will be giving further consideration to the wording of the policy)?

3.2 Is the criterion within Policy H1 relating to the conversion of rural buildings (Section 5) d)) consistent with national policy?

3.3 Is the criterion within Policy H1 relating to the subdivision of existing dwellings (Section 5) f)) consistent with national policy?

4. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (Policy H4)

4.1 Does the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) robustly assess the need for residential and transit sites in the District?

4.2 Does Policy H4 as modified make clear any residual requirement for traveller pitches/plots and how these will be provided?

4.3 Does the use of a criteria based policy to meet the residual need for traveller sites reflect a positively prepared LP?

4.4 Are the criteria within Policy H4 consistent with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)?

Main Evidence Base

SD.13.5 - Policy & Strategy Topic Paper

SD.18 – Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessments

SD.24 – Local Plan and Site Allocations Viability Study

EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions

EL1.001d Council response to Inspector's follow up questions

Schedule of Main Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 6 - 13.30 Thursday 11 October 2018

Matter 6

Employment Policies (including town centres and tourism)

This matter considers policies relating to employment, town centres and tourism (Sections 8.2 and 8.4 of the LP).

The Council proposes to modify Policies E1, E2, E3, E4, TCR1 and TCR3 in response to the Inspector's Preliminary Questions.

Issues

1. Existing Employment Land and Sites

1.1 Will Policies SS4, E1 and E3 (as modified) provide sufficient flexibility to provide a range of employment uses on employment sites?

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

1.2 Is Policy E3 consistent with paragraph 22 of the Framework and the long term protection of sites allocated or safeguarded for employment use?

1.3 Are the criteria within Policy E3 relating to loss of employment land too onerous?

2. Employment Development

2.1 Do the policies of the LP provide sufficient support for employment development within the District, specifically the rural areas (Policies E1 and the Area Strategy Policies in particular)?

3. Main Town Centre Uses

The Council has referred to the limited food offer, loss of expenditure in Biddulph and the Town Centre Area Action Plan in justifying the allocation of a site for a foodstore on Wharf Road.

3.1 Taking into account the above is the allocation of a site for a discount foodstore in Biddulph justified on qualitative grounds and will it be on the most sequentially preferable site?

3.2 Does the extent of the town centre boundaries for Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle reflect primary shopping frontages and the location of other town centre uses within and close to the town centres?

3.3 Is the proposal to draw the town centre boundaries more tightly than shown in the Retail Study (ED25.1) justified?

3.4 Is Policy TCR2 clear as how uses other than retail will be considered within primary frontages?

3.5 Is the impact threshold of 200 m² within Policy TCR3 for town centre uses outside town centres justified?

3.6 Would the threshold restrict the development of sustainably located local convenience stores?

4. Tourism

4.1 Taking into account proposed modifications is Policy E4 justified and consistent with national policy?

4.2 Is Policy E4 too restrictive in favouring tourism development in locations with good connectivity or close to settlements?

4.3 Does Policy SS11 (the Churnet Valley Strategy) provide sufficient support for:

- *Tourism related developments close to Churnet Valley; and,*
- *Sustainable transport modes?*

Main Evidence Base

ED13 – Site Allocations Topic Papers

ED17 – Employment Land Studies

ED25 - Retail and Town Centre Studies

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

ED32.1 – Biddulph Town Centre Action Plan

EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions

Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 7 - 9.30 Friday 12 October 2018

Matter 7

Generic Development Management Policies

This matter considers the Generic Development Management Policies (Sections 8.5, 8.6, 8.7 and 8.8 of the LP). The Council proposes some modifications to the explanation and policies arising from the Inspector's preliminary questions.

Issues

1. Development Management Policies

1.1 Are the development management policies (as modified) positively prepared and consistent with national policy?

1.2 Should Policy DC2 include requirements that the Council is proactive in tackling buildings at risk?

1.3 Do Policies C3, NE1 and NE2 provide sufficient protection for the GI network and biodiversity sites within the District?

1.4 Are the terms of the 2nd section of Policy T1 consistent with national policy (in particular paragraph 34 of the Framework)?

2. Community Facilities and Open Space

2.1 Does Policy C1 (as modified) provide sufficient protection for community facilities?

2.2 Does Policy C1 (as modified) take into account that some facilities such as those providing healthcare are outdated and may need to be redeveloped for alternative uses?

2.3 Is Policy C2 (as modified) positively prepared and clear to the decision maker in respect of provision of open space on new developments?

In relation to 'qualifying development' this would be 11 dwellings or more in accordance with the PPG.

Main Evidence Base

SD5.2 – Response from Sport England

SD22.1 – Landscape and Settlement Character Assessments

EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions

EL1.001d Council response to Inspector's follow up questions

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 8 – 09.30 Tuesday 16 October 2018

Matter 8 – Allocations

Leek

This matter considers the housing, employment and mixed-use allocations in Leek and Leekbrook (H2, E2, DSL1, DSL2, DSL3, DSL4, DSR2 and DSR3).

The Council propose modifications to the Strategic Development Site Policies to remove generic requirements which are covered by other policies of the LP but include bespoke requirements.

Issues

1. Identification of Sites

1.1 Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in Leek robust?

1.2 Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in Leek?

1.3 What is the up to date position in relation to planning permissions affecting the proposed allocations?

2. Land east of Horsecroft Farm (DSL1)

2.1 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

2.2 Is the site viable and deliverable taking into account the need to extend the school and the potential for landfill gas migration?

3. Land at the Mount (DSL2)

3.1 What are the implications of The Mount as a recreational resource for the allocation?

3.2 Is the Council satisfied that landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, heritage, highway, transport, air quality and flood risk impacts can be mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

3.3 Should parts of the allocation be safeguarded as Local Green Space, Green Infrastructure (GI) or open space?

3.4 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

3.5 Should the policy include a requirement for master planning and phasing of the school site?

3.6 Is the site deliverable given the multiple ownerships?

3.7 Does the wind turbine at The Mount have any implications for delivery of the

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

allocation?

4. Land adjacent to Newton House (DSL3)

4.1 Should the policy be more prescriptive in terms of the employment component and phasing and/or include a requirement for master planning the development as a whole and not just the heritage aspects?

4.2 Are all the key development considerations necessary and clear to the decision maker?

4.3 Is the site deliverable given potential costs such as remediation?

5. Land at Cornhill East (DSL4)

5.1 Should the policy be more prescriptive in terms of the employment component, link road and phasing and/or include a requirement for master planning the development as a whole?

5.2 Are on-site nature conservation designations capable of being mitigated?

5.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

5.4 Is the site deliverable taking into account the link road and access requirements over 3rd party land? (Note – the link road is described as ‘desirable’ infrastructure in the IDP, not ‘essential’)

6. Land east of Brooklands Way, Leekbrook (DSR2)

6.1 Should the allocation be extended to 8ha to allow ecological mitigation?

6.2 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

6.3 Are on-site nature conservation designations capable of being mitigated?

6.4 Should the policy include specific reference to the setting of the nearby Grade II listed farmhouse?*

6.5 Is the site deliverable taking into account the need to access the site via Brooklands Way and potentially remove existing buildings?

7. Land west of Basford Lane, Leekbrook (DSR3)

7.1 Would the allocation secure a good standard of amenity for existing residential occupants in the vicinity?

7.2 Should the allocation be extended to 1.67ha to allow mitigation?

7.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

7.4 Is the site deliverable taking into account topography and landscape constraints?

8. Infrastructure

7.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in Leek be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space?

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

9. Delivery

9.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocations realistic?

Main Evidence Base

SD13.1 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Leek

SD13.4 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Rural Areas

SD17 – Employment Land Studies

SD21 – Infrastructure Studies

SD26 – SHLAA

EL1.002b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions on allocations

Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 9 – 13.30 Tuesday 16 October 2018

Matter 8 – Allocations

Biddulph

This matter considers the housing, employment and mixed use allocations in Biddulph (H2, E2, DSB1, DSB2 and DSB3).

The Council proposes modifications to the Strategic Development Site Policies to remove generic requirements which are covered by other policies of the LP but include bespoke requirements and to explain the exceptional circumstances justifying Green Belt release.

Issues

1. Identification of Sites

1.1 Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in Biddulph robust?

1.2 Do the Green Belt assessments support the allocations in Biddulph?

1.3 Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in Biddulph?

1.4 What is the up to date position in relation to planning permissions affecting the proposed allocations?

2. Wharf Road Strategic Development Area (SDA) (DSB1)

2.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt to the west of Biddulph Valley Way (BVW)?

2.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the LP?

2.3 In what ways would the release of land to the west of BVW assist in bringing

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

forward the Wharf Road SDA?

2.4 Is the Council satisfied that the landscape, heritage, mining legacy, biodiversity, access, transport and flood risk constraints are capable of being mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

2.5 What are the implications of providing access across the BVW for its value as a sustainable transport route?

2.6 Are the density assumptions realistic taking into account market signals?

2.7 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

2.8 Is the site deliverable taking into account the multiple ownerships involved and constraints such as the mining legacy?

3. Biddulph Mills (DSB2)

3.1 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

4. Tunstall Road SDA (DSB2)

4.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt?

4.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the LP?

4.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

4.4 Is the site deliverable taking into account the multiple ownerships involved?

4.5 Should the extent of the allocation be amended as part of it is controlled by an unwilling landowner?

5. Infrastructure

5.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in Biddulph be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space?

6. Delivery

6.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocations realistic?

Main Evidence Base

SD8 – Infrastructure Delivery Plans

SD13.2 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Biddulph

SD17 – Employment Land Studies

SD21 – Infrastructure Studies

SD22.4, 22.6 and 22.7 – Green Belt Studies

SD26 – SHLAA

EL1.002b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions on allocations

Schedule of Modifications

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 10 – 09.30 Wednesday 17 October 2018

Matter 8 – Allocations

Cheadle

This matter considers the housing, employment and mixed use allocations in Cheadle (H2, E2, DSC1, DSC2, DSC3 and DSC4).

The Council proposes modifications to the Strategic Development Site Policies to remove generic requirements which are covered by other policies of the LP but include bespoke requirements and to explain the exceptional circumstances justifying Green Belt release.

Issues

1. Identification of Sites

1.1 Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in Cheadle robust?

1.2 Do the Green Belt assessments support the allocations in Cheadle?

1.3 Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in Cheadle?

1.4 What is the up to date position in relation to planning permissions affecting the proposed allocations?

2. Cheadle North SDA (DSC1)

2.1 Is the development in a location that is or can be made sustainable?

2.2 Should the site allocation be adjusted to incorporate land to be used for open space/surface water mitigation and/or land covered by the planning application?

2.3 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

2.4 Should the policy include a requirement for the phasing of the school site?

2.5 Is the site deliverable taking into account the lack of progress since its allocation in the CS and the requirement to deliver a primary school?

3. Cecilly Brook SDA (DSC2)

3.1 What is the justification for including the two separate sites within the same SDA other than their proximity to Cecilly Brook?

3.2 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

3.3 Should land beyond the site to be used for open space/surface water mitigation be included within the allocation?

4. Mobberley Farm (DSC3)

4.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt?

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

- 4.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the LP?*
- 4.3 Is the Council satisfied that landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, heritage, highway, transport and flood risk impacts can be mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?*
- 4.4 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?*
- 4.5 Should land beyond the site to be used for open space/surface water mitigation be included within the allocation?*
- 4.6 Should the disused railway line to the north of the allocation be included as GI?*
- 4.7 Would delivery of sufficient housing numbers in Cheadle, the site and the link road be assisted by the inclusion of additional land within the allocation?*
- 4.8 Is the site deliverable taking into account different ownerships including land required for access?*
- 4.9 Are the density assumptions reasonable?*
- 5. Land north of New Haden Road (DSC4)**
- 5.1 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?*
- 5.2 Can a safe and suitable access be achieved to the site?*
- 6. Housing allocation at Stoddards Depot (CH015)**
- 6.1 Is the Stoddards Depot site (CH015) deliverable taking into account contamination issues and other abnormal costs?*
- 7. Infrastructure**
- 7.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in Cheadle be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space?*
- 7.2 Is the new link road in Cheadle necessary, viable and deliverable within the plan period? (Note – the link road is described as ‘desirable’ infrastructure in the IDP, not ‘essential’)*
- 7.3 Will development lead to severe residual highway impacts in Cheadle taking into account improvements that can be undertaken to the transport network?*
- 8. Delivery**
- 8.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocations realistic?*

Main Evidence Base

SD8 – Infrastructure Delivery Plans

SD13.3 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Cheadle

SD17 – Employment Land Studies

SD21 – Infrastructure Studies

SD26 – SHLAA

EL1.002b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions on allocations

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 11 – 14.30 Wednesday 17 October 2018

Matter 8 – Allocations

Villages

This matter considers the housing, employment and mixed-use allocations in the Larger Villages and elsewhere in the rural area other than Leekbrook (see Session 8) (H2, E2, DSR1 and DSR4,).

The Council proposes:

- Site allocation policies for Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor and Bolton Copperworks, Froghall in response to the Inspector's preliminary questions.
- Modifications to the Strategic Development Site Policies to remove generic requirements which are covered by other policies of the LP but include bespoke requirements and to explain the exceptional circumstances justifying Green Belt release.

Issues

1. Identification of Sites

- 1.1 *Is the approach within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assessing the suitability and screening of sites in the settlements robust?*
- 1.2 *Do the Green Belt assessments support the allocations in the large villages?*
- 1.3 *Does the LP provide for a range of sites of different sizes in the rural area?*
- 1.4 *What is the up to date position in relation to planning permissions affecting the proposed allocations?*

2. Blythe Vale (DSR1)

- 2.1 *Is the Council satisfied that landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, heritage, highway, transport and flood risk impacts can be mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?*
- 2.2 *Is the allocation in a location where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable travel modes can be maximised? Can reasonable connectivity to the village be secured from the development, particularly the housing component?*
- 2.3 *Would the residual cumulative impacts of the development on A50/A521 junction be less than severe taking into account any improvements that can be carried out?*
- 2.4 *Should the policy be more prescriptive in terms of the employment component and phasing, noting the requirement for master planning?*
- 2.5 *Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?*

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

2.6 Is the site deliverable taking into account multiple ownerships, infrastructure requirements and the possible need for cross-subsidy?

3. Land off Ash Bank Road, Werrington (DSR4)

3.1 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt?

3.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the LP?

3.3 Are the landscape impacts acceptable?

3.4 Can safe and suitable accesses and sustainable links to village facilities be achieved for the sites?

3.5 Will living conditions for future occupants be acceptable given the proximity of the allocations to the prison?

3.6 Are all the policy requirements necessary and clear to the decision maker?

4. Housing allocation at Endon (EN128)

4.1 Can a safe and suitable access be achieved to the site?

4.2 Should the site be safeguarded as Local Green Space, GI or open space?

4.3 Are the effects on the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity acceptable?

4.4 Can any flood risk and surface water issues be mitigated?

5. Allocations at Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor and Bolton Copperworks, Froghall

5.1 Do the policies for the two sites meet the tests of soundness?

5.2 Should the site at Anzio Camp refer to extra care housing taking into account its isolated location?

6. Local Green Space

6.1 Are the Local Green Space designations at Ox Pasture, Cheddleton and north of Cotehill Road, Werrington justified?

7. Infrastructure

7.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in the villages be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space?

7.2 What measures can be put in place to maintain or enhance rural bus services?

8. Delivery

8.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from the allocations realistic?

Main Evidence Base

SD8 – Infrastructure Delivery Plans

SD13.4 – Site Allocations Topic Paper Rural Areas

SD17 – Employment Land Studies

SD21 – Infrastructure Studies

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

SD26 – SHLAA

EL1.002b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions on allocations
Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined

Session 12 – 09.30 Friday 19 October 2018

Matter 9

Infrastructure, Planning Obligations and Delivery

This matter considers overall infrastructure provision and its implications for viability and deliverability.

Issues

1. The evidence base underpinning the LP

1.1 Does the Local Plan and Site Allocations Viability Study make realistic assumptions about land values, sales values, profit and development costs?

2. Policy SS12

2.1 Will Policy SS12 and the allocation policies of the LP ensure that necessary infrastructure is delivered and in a timely fashion?

2.2. Should Policy SS12 make specific reference to all the legal and policy tests for planning obligations?

3. Pooling of Contributions

3.1 What are the implications arising from the pooling restrictions with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations for the delivery of infrastructure?

4. Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

4.1 Is the IDP clear as to what infrastructure projects are critical to the delivery of the LP, when infrastructure will be delivered, sources of funding and who is responsible for delivery?

4.2 Should the IDP be more specific as to which developments will contribute to particular infrastructure projects?

4.3 Does the IDP take into account the likely impact on waste water and surface water infrastructure?

5. Supplementary Planning Guidance

5.1 What SPD will be prepared to provide guidance and what is the timetable for its production?

5.2 Would the SPD be likely to add additional policy and financial burdens on development?

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Main Evidence Base

SD8 – Infrastructure Delivery Plans
SD21 – Infrastructure Reports
SD24.1 - Local Plan and Site Allocations Viability Study
SD004 – Infrastructure Delivery Plan
EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions
Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC
Others to be determined

Session 13 – 11.30 Friday 19 October 2018

Matter 10

Implementation and Monitoring

The purpose of this session is to examine the implementation and monitoring provisions of the LP.

The Council propose to modify the LP so that the circumstances where a full or partial review of the LP is necessary are clearer.

Issues

1. Indicators and Targets

1.1. Are the Performance Monitoring Indicators and targets specific and measurable?

2. Review Mechanisms

2.1 Is the LP clear as to when a review or partial review of the LP would be triggered due to a failure to meet key targets, for example for those relating to the delivery of housing?

2.2 Should the LP include a review mechanism in the event that there are unmet needs arising from Stoke or Newcastle-under-Lyme?

Main Evidence Base

EL1.001b - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions
Schedule of Modifications

Participants

SMDC
Others to be determined

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Session 14 – 11.30 Tuesday 23 October 2018 **Review Session**

The purpose of the session is to review the findings of the hearing sessions, to confirm what Main Modifications, if any, are proposed to the LP, and discuss how the Examination will proceed hereafter.

Participants

SMDC

Others to be determined