

**In Response to the further information provided during the Planning Inspectors 'Matters and Issues' and responses given by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC), Cheadle Unite (CU) wish to raise the following Matters here in text and where appropriate verbally in support and addition to the CU Representation to SMDC submitted 11<sup>th</sup> April 2018 and forwarded by SMDC to the Inspector:**

**Our Objective is a significant reduction in housing allocation for Cheadle (and the Moorlands) and to draw focus on Sustainable Brownfield site regeneration with cross authority co-operation with Stoke-on-Trent, the Potteries.**

**In general the points raised are new since the last Planning Inspection in 2013.**

**Cheadle Unite Committee**

**23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018**

**[www.cheadleunite.co.uk](http://www.cheadleunite.co.uk)**

## 1. Compliance with procedural requirements including consultation/participation procedures

### **Background:**

SMDC have taken high level housing allocation at every opportunity, despite receiving a very significant number of representations from the Moorlands and Cheadle Community. Not least 5000 representations across the Moorlands (2015+) as held by SMDC [1]. Further they have over the planning period had significantly reduced ONS population and DCLG Housing requirement predictions that have not been effectively disseminated and worked on collaboratively with the local community to inform an objective plan in line with the communities wishes and effective national policy.

### **CU Position:**

#### **Example of the lack of Community Involvement on the SCI Policy.**

In March 2014 CU made representation [2] on the proposed SCI policy on a number of matters including requests that SMDC engage with the Potteries on housing provision with transparency and also provide access into SMDC's Drivers and Motivators. We had no further opportunity to engage with SMDC on the policy. We were notified via email a year later (5th March 2015) that SMDC had apparently adopted their new SCI policy [3] way back on the 10<sup>th</sup> Dec 2014 and we had from the 13<sup>th</sup> Jan to 13<sup>th</sup> April 2015 to object (only 5½ weeks) and our objection path was via the high court.

We responded 11<sup>th</sup> March 2015 [4] to SMDC regarding serious concerns about the lack of Community Involvement in the creation of the SCI policy and the approach taken.

In response on the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015 SMDC issued us with a SCI Report [5], the first and only feedback regarding our contribution to the SCI Policy:

Regarding transparency on their Duty to Co-operate (Dtc) on matters with other Councils:  
*'Meetings held between the Council and other public and private bodies are not open to the public'.*

Regarding our request for more transparency on the drivers and motivators for SMDC Policy given the apparent disparity between resident's aspirations and SMDC policy:  
*This is not within the remit of the SCI and it is not considered appropriate for publication in this document.*

Every point we made was stamped 'No Changes to the SCI Policy'. We were also informed:  
*'There was no further consultation; the SCI is not required to undergo public examination.'*

There were only 15 responders to the consultation and the threat was the High Court if we weren't happy with their 'Statement of Community Involvement'.

Our understanding was, this was a new interaction framework for local communities and SMDC policies. In reality it was a push back against effective community involvement. Transparency, for example, on cross council collaboration is very important not least where potential political posturing could prevent effective policy.

Regarding matters of Community Involvement relating to a Dtc with other authorities (Matter 2) we are presented with a closed door policy.

### **As an early example of the SCI policy;**

In response to an email regarding lack of community involvement on planning applications around Brookhouses and Thorley Drive Cheadle (2015), SMDC responded [6]. *'The onus on wider community engagement rests with the applicant.'* SMDC then referenced evidence presented to them by the developers. At the same time SMDC Planning Department were pro-actively engaged supporting the developers in making their application, presenting for example a 20 page supporting report for just Thorley Drive to the Planning Committee (PC) [7]. Residents were aghast at SMDCs stance and were not offered any similar support.

On Presentation to the Planning Committee, when it became apparent they were about to refuse permission due to very genuine road infrastructure concerns, SMDC Senior Officers and Legal Advisors attempted to take the PC into a private session, to what end was not clear. On that occasion the PC stood their ground and refused a private session. However SMDC did in public state the developers may pursue a 'cost order' against the Council. We felt a clear attempt to sway the Committee (subsequently replaced and voted through).

When asked about legal liability for any potential errors that SMDC may have supplied to support the developers, we had no response. We felt the Developers could clearly sight SMDC, passing liability back to the Council (funded by unsupported Moorlands resident's) exempting developers and presenting residents with an impossible situation.

Cheadle Residents who are made aware of any consultation, without computer access and the necessary skills, (typically the elderly) rely on documents held within a Council room of Cheadle Library (often closed while the library is open), dumped in a large box which is chaotic to say the least.

Surely by definition an SCI Policy needs to be inclusive, responsive to community input and be adaptive.

We have therefore had to take the view that SMDC activity and accountability will ultimately be addressed through robust Government Inspection.

### **Example on Community involvement on housing levels:**

Karen Bradley MP and Housing Minister Brandon Lewis have made it clear on local Radio and in writing respectively that it is for the local community to decide the level of housing they require.

The response to a petition by over 1000 Cheadle residents regarding our excessive housing proposals UIN:P001411 2015 [8] represented to Parliament by Sir Bill Cash MP clearly states:

*Observations from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government:  
This Government do not set national housing targets or require councils to provide more houses than are needed. Our abolition of regional strategies decentralised decision making on matters such as housing provision to local authorities and communities, enabling them to plan for growth and other priorities in their areas. We are supporting this process through the duty to co-operate which requires councils to work together constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in planning for strategic matters in their local plans.*

Sir Bill Cash MP was asked by Radio Stoke about SMDC's plans for over 6000 houses (14<sup>th</sup> March 2015). *'I have been working with Cheadle for over a Year now and more and basically the position is extremely unsatisfactory. I wrote a very strong letter to the Council regarding this consultation process and at the heart of it is the fact that there simply is no Justification for the degree of expansion, particularly having regard to the fact that in Stoke-on-Trent there are many Brownfield Sites that should be done for housing.'*

*'I have written regarding a whole series of planning matters, Forsbrook, Checkley, Caverswall, Dilhorne..... 'The list is very extensive I have written and objected to the plans being put forward in all these areas and I am extremely concerned that this is going on.'*

The Radio Presenter stated he had asked the SMDC Leader (Sybil Ralphs) if she had asked S-o-T if they would share some of our 6000 allocation and she said she hadn't... Was that a mistake? *'Yes. Stoke-on-Trent has Brownfield Sites'.. 'I have proposed a Bill that proposes a greater use of Brownfield Sites.'.. 'The Government is responding to all of this'.. 'I am extremely concerned with the way the consultation process is being conducted.'*

The Leader of the Council Cllr Sybil Ralphs stated on Radio Stoke [9] *'that we (SMDC) have to convince the inspector, and the people of Staffordshire Moorlands through us, have to convince the planning inspector that 6000 houses are neither wanted or needed.'*

The above reflects the position even before 2012 ONS population and 2015 DCLG Housing Level predictions were available, detailing a very significantly drop in expected housing provision requirements.

However it is important to detail that SMDC have not worked with community involvement on how this affects the Core Strategy. Instead this information was withheld from residents during the 2015/16 consultation and SMDC spent funds on commissioning a report to justify retention of high level housing provision using a flawed Oxford economics Model.

SMDC Leader of the Council Sybil Ralphs after consultation with Executive has stated to the community and to councillors (2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016 Council Assembly) that the Planning Inspector effectively sets the level.

Sybil claims that while SMDC can set a lower figure the Planning officer will simply reject it.

#### **Issues:**

**CU wish to raise the following for inspection:**

- 1) By what mechanism and evidence base have the Views of the local community been effectively considered as part of the SCI?**
- 2) How are the significant (5000+ Representations 2015 on) used to influence the chosen level of housing provision for Cheadle and the Moorlands in the context that almost all figures used are near the maximum levels of all metrics.**
- 3) Evidence that SMDC as per Cllr Sybil Ralphs statement on Radio Stoke [9] and in line with community involvement made significant effort to convince the Planning Inspector that a level of over 6000 houses is *'neither wanted, nor needed.'***

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

### Background:

Many Residents are angry at the prospect of Greenfield and Agricultural land being used for Housing in towns and rural areas around the Moorlands where for example around Cheadle traffic surveys have flagged that the road infrastructure is already running 'at capacity'. Further and fully aware of the collapse of the 'Renew' Campaign 2011 to regenerate Brownfield sites around our local City there are very many boarded up Brownfield sites around proven infrastructure. A small sample of Stoke City's Brownfield Sites [10] has already been sent to Parliament via our Local MP. For 8 years CU have been asking SMDC for genuine outreach collaboration with S-o-T / the Potteries (9 Miles away). We believe the response by SMDC to the Inspector regarding DtC with S-o-T is evasive as does Cheadle Town Council (10 Sept 18). The Process requires genuine outreach and 2 way engagement.

### CU Position:

CU submitted a FOI request (21<sup>st</sup> September 2014) to SMDC for:

*'copies of correspondence regarding discussions on housing levels (numbers) for Cheadle, between SMDC and neighbouring local authorities (S-o-T / Potteries, Newcastle-under-Lyme (N-u-L)) along with any correspondence with any Government appointed bodies, covering the period of the start of the development of your Core Strategy until 21<sup>st</sup> September 2014.'*

The 9 page Response [11] is very light on content given the period covered and in our opinion shows no drive of commitment from SMDC to work on housing level with S-o-T & N-u-L Councils.

On Page2: A response from S-o-T City Council (5<sup>th</sup> Jul 2012), regarding a potential shift of 500 houses from Cheadle to S-o-T states:

*'Both Councils (S-o-T & N-u-L) were supportive of Staffordshire Moorlands reduction in their housing figures by 500 dwellings which in part will strengthen the conurbations ability to bring forward previously developed sites... Stoke and Newcastle ... understand and support the principle of stemming out migration from the City to surrounding areas '*

The highlighted text above appears to have been cut from what the only substantive document on housing allocation and pasted into the Previous Planning Inspection Final Report (Patrick Whitehead Jan 2014).

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate Page 4 Clearly States:

10

*Concerns have arisen about the ongoing effectiveness of the CS in meeting strategic priorities for housing in the light of the reduction in housing numbers by 500 related to the RS Phase 2 Revision proposal for 6,000 dwellings in the period 2006 -2026. Whilst specific concerns relating to the CS are considered later in this report, there is an indication of clear support for the lower figure from neighbouring authorities Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme on the basis that this will strengthen the conurbation's ability to bring forward previously developed sites and support the principle of stemming outmigration [doc K(1), paras 3.62 – 3.63]. Nevertheless, during the Examination the Council has given further consideration to the total housing numbers. These, and other more general issues related to the revocation of the West Midlands RS are dealt with later.*

The statement 'there is indication' and apparent cut and paste would suggest that Patrick Whitehead was presented with a very thin evidence base of genuine collaboration in line with our subsequent FOI request.

We would like to reference the Leader of the Council (Cllr Sybil Ralphs (SR)) interview with Radio Stoke Following 5000 representations to SMDC in 2015 [9].

When Asked about Cheadle Unite's Request for over 5 years that SMDC talk to Stoke City on re-allocation of housing to Stoke she provides what can only be described as a competitive response rather than collaborative. Cllr Ralphs acknowledges at least 5000 representations, the vast majority of which are against the proposed 6000+ houses, but when presented with the governments housing projection of 2570 houses (as a basis for a reduction and for asking Stoke to take on some of our allocation) provides a response that is not in line with local aspirations and instead infers growth requirements, whilst simultaneously highlighting the need for major infrastructure improvements to the Moorlands (that clearly have not been addressed).

In the context that we had at the time been asking for collaboration for over 5 years when Cabinet Member for Regeneration housing Jack Brereton Stoke Council was interviewed, he made it clear to Radio Stoke that they were 'open for co-operation', but clearly nothing significant was taking place. When Cllr Ralphs was asked about approaching Stoke to take on some of our allocation, stated as 'desperate for more growth' she clearly evades the question.

SMDC's Annual Monitoring report 2016/17 Indicates only 33 affordable homes were built across the Moorlands (2016-17) and 19 in the previous year. While residents recognise a need for affordable housing within the Moorlands, collaboration with S-o-T on prioritised Brownfield regeneration would surely signal to developers a certainty that investment in the City will pay off.

*'Building the homes that we need does not mean ruining vast tracks of beautiful countryside it doesn't mean that at all, it just means working with local communities to make sensible informed decisions about what is needed and where and finding the right sites to do that. Many of those sites already exist as part of the urban landscape' .. ' in Bristol, a Brownfield register of 248 sites have been identified across the city and none of them requires the loss of a single piece of Greenfield land*

Current Secretary of State for Housing C&LG Sajid Javid MP

We recently submitted a further FOI request from both SMDC and Stoke City Council to determine the level of further co-operation that has and is occurring since 2014 (no response in time for this document) as evidence that has informed the Core strategy submitted in Feb 2018, specifically with a view to SMDC reaching out to Stoke and Newcastle given that we have serious infrastructure and local objection and the Potteries having no shortfall in land provision, Infrastructure and Brownfield Sites.

We can see on SMDC website that SD9 Documents Duty to Co-operate exist, these documents post date the Submission of the Local Plan (Feb 2018) and even now are largely a statement of position.

The 'Statement of Common ground' document June 2018 states that it 'establishes a framework for co-operation between SMDC, SCC, S-o-T and NuLBC'. I.e. a future sitting outside of the consultation period, it lacks genuine evidence of strategic collaboration on protecting green fields and agricultural land and prioritising Brownfield development around proven infrastructure, Road, Rail Bus routes etc.

#### **Issues:**

**Regarding 2.1 'evidence the council has co-operated effectively' CU request for Inspection:**

**1) The evidence base of SMDC's Duty to Cooperate successes with S-o-T Councils during the formation of the published Core Strategy and before it's submission to planning inspection (Feb 2018). This means detailed minutes meetings etc where detailed strategy is discussed implemented and produced a successful (effective) outcome.**

**CU are concerned that as per 2013 (when some token gesture of co-operation was stated to the press), that there may be no substantive engagement. The history of co-operation between 2013 and Jan 2018 will be a key indicator of how the Core Strategy has been informed and the spirit with which it will be taken forward.**

**We understand the DtC is a constant, as is clarified in item [8] by the Secretary of State C&LG.**

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

### **Background:**

Cheadle Residents recognises a duty to provide a reasonable amount and mix of housing provision to meet local needs. However the Housing proposals for Cheadle (and the Moorlands) are far too high. The allocation of over 1350 houses for Cheadle represents around 26% growth in the size of the town over just 14 years.

The 2012 ONS Population Figures and 2015 Housing Projections clearly indicate a levelling off of housing need across the Moorlands. A provision of 26% growth for Cheadle is grossly unreasonable and is not sustainable. Further many hundreds of representations and a petition (over 1000 signatures) from Cheadle residents appear to have fallen on deaf ears (as have 5000 across the Moorlands).

Traffic Road Surveys (held by the Council) have already highlighted that Cheadle roads are already running 'at capacity'. Also evidenced by Residents [12]. Which we believe is a significant understatement at peak times. Despite a long term awareness that Cheadle road infrastructure is constrained (e.g. A road Traffic Plan for Staffordshire 2000). No road improvements have been made or are likely to be made when the concept of a link road is 'desirable'. SMDC are aware of our road problems, (not least having explored options for a North West link with JCB) but nothing solid has come forward, we believe because the costs are prohibitive. We have highlighted genuine health concerns from diesel vehicles in slow moving traffic where our children walk to school. Cllr Ralphs has on numerous occasions stated that Cheadle needs investment with 'not another brick' statements until major infrastructure improvements have been made.

The Inspector has already risen what we believe are genuine concerns regarding SMDC reaching for higher housing figures based on a backlog of provision (dressed as under-investment), this argument has been presented on a number of occasions for Cheadle. There is no evidence or Justification for this.

SMDC claim market indicators justify significant housing requirement. This appears to be based purely on developer applications. We believe this is an SMDC self made prophecy based on SMDC overstating market potential. The reality is that very few of these development proposals are in fact being built. Of 378 proposed developments for Cheadle dating back to 1998 only half (190) have been completed to 2017.

Cheadle has poor road infrastructure and is not appropriate or sustainable as a commuter town. What little capacity Cheadle has for road traffic should be protected for its tourism aspirations.

Cheadle Town Council have discussed the Inspection (10<sup>th</sup> Sept 2018) and have highlighted even in documents that post date the core strategy (Statement of Common Ground) concerns that S-o-T have not been approached regarding a diversion of Cheadle housing allocation. In that meeting it was clear that the Council had concerns over SMDC overstating the infrastructure that exists around Cheadle, this includes the Hospital, Library, youth services, Police station open hours and limited bus services.

It was clear that despite making provision for significant housing development over 30+ years, little significant infra-structure improvements have been implemented. There is no evidence this will change, further crippling infrastructure when further housing provision is made.

CTC highlighted, that SMDC are drawing on the '*maximum values*' in all areas and '*SMDC have provided insufficient evidence to justify a housing increase from 195 to 320*' (dpa).

### **Issue:**

SMDC Propose excessive and unsubstantiated levels of development for Cheadle, despite being fully aware of Infrastructure issues not least with our Roads. Matter 3 of the Planning Inspection deals with Housing OAN needs however, SMDC's draw on a Nathaniel Lichfield Partners (2016) Report Commissioned to justify retention of excessive housing requirements, sitting against the wishes of Moorlands residents, it makes unreasonable and unsustainable case for inflated housing needs based on a flawed Oxford economics Model. We believe this model plays a significant role in inappropriately inflating the figures proposed for Cheadle. Please reserve us the right to come back on this matter.

**Session 3 – 09.30 Wednesday 10 October 2018 Matter 3**  
**Housing and Employment Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) and Requirements**

**Background:**

CU recognises a duty to provide a reasonable amount and mix of housing provision to meet local needs. However the Housing proposals are far too high. The 2012 ONS Population Figures and 2015 Housing Projections clearly indicate a levelling off of housing need across the Moorlands.

**Issue:**

SMDC draw on a Nathaniel Lichfield Partners (2016) Report Commissioned to justify retention of excessive housing requirements, sitting against the wishes of Moorlands residents it makes a ridiculous and unsustainable case for inflated housing need based on an Oxford economics. Stating a net migration of 7,697 people is required to 2031 to provide a net increase of 85 Jobs. This model as already stated in our representation is seriously flawed not least on long term sustainability and a highly likely demographic of elderly migrants, it is likely to make the situation worse and fails to recognise the existing communities ability to adapt (e.g. optional longer working). We would like to also highlight :

Secretary of State for Housing C&LG Sajid Javid MP

Regarding Housing need Assessments:

*'The existing system simply isn't good enough, it relies on assessments commissioned by individual authorities according to their own requirements carried out by expensive consultants using their own methodologies. The Result is an opaque mish-mash of different figures that are consistent only in their complexity. This piecemeal approach simply does not give an accurate picture of housing need across the country. Nor does it impress Local People who see their area taking on a huge number of new homes while a town on the other side of a local authority boundary barely expands at all.'*

Speech on 'Planning for the right Houses in the right places' 14<sup>th</sup> Sept 2017

For clarity in our case our neighbouring local authority S-o-T, have vast areas of Brownfield Derelict sites struggling to attract development. The policy threatens the whole of the Moorlands including Towns, villages and hamlets with unsustainable and unnecessary over development and undermines our City.

To that end Cheadle Unite Request the Nathaniel report is struck off the evidence base for SMDC's justification of over 6000 houses across the Moorlands significantly lowering the OAN range from 250-440 dpa to 100-195 dpa, (2572 over the period) In line with removal of the Oxford Model.

Cheadle Unites Position on Matters 1-3 are of serious concern, not least in the way they impact on all following Matters.

Background:

The retention of high OAN figures provides a mechanism for SMDC to allow inappropriate developments to take place under a claim of inadequate 5-year provision. By setting a far more realistic level Residents can protect Green fields and open spaces.

By way of evidence:

SMDC have had many years to address the Core Strategy which is now many years late. During that time they have encouraged developers to the Moorlands in the full knowledge that their policies expose areas outside of the development strategy to potential development.

Cheadle By example already has provision for 338 houses (Inc Cecily Brook), many sites have been available for over 12 months. The vast majority have not been developed.

Issue:

Residents have been living under a prolonged and constant cloud of inappropriate development under a claim of lack of 5 years housing supply for many years now. Not least with a very significant number of consultations over nearly a decade (2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2015, 2017) apparently having no significant impact on policy.

While the Lack of 5 year supply should focus any Council on producing an effective Core Strategy to make sure all housing is appropriate, this clearly has not been the case in the Moorlands, Instead it has generally been used to ward off changes to their plan, claiming that if changes are made, the Planning Inspector will simply reject those plans (2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016 Council Assembly) and allow developers to build anywhere.

It clearly isn't appropriate that if residents highlight failings in an aggressive policy, that they should then suffer with a lack of 5 year supply claim.

**We would like the Inspector to indicate that developments will no longer be considered outside of Local Brownfield and regional Regeneration sites.**

**Background:**

SMDC Annual Monitoring Report 2016/17 Indicate that affordable housing needs are clearly not being met:

Year	Total
2014-15	225
2015-16	19
2016-17	33

Affordable housing is a contentious matter not least given that it includes social housing.

Affordable housing for our younger generation to support local Business opportunities is not forthcoming across the Moorlands. JCB for example pays a median salary of around £25,500 (Source Indeed). There are currently (Sept 2018) five 1 or 2 bedroom properties available on Right-move around Cheadle for less than £90,000, however new builds are likely to be significantly higher than this and out of the reach of our younger generation. Further any commuter employment will require a car and travel on congested roads. The demographic of residents around the Moorlands is clearly elderly and that trend will continue with £150K+ housing developments.

Further, If the genuine infra-structure costs which are necessary for example around Cheadle (as per Sir Bill Cash MP already highlighted assertions, Cllr Ralphs own declaration [9] and further evidence such as 'A road traffic Plan for Staffordshire 2000'), are included, then the true costs is much higher for sizeable developments. In addition to roads and footpaths they include for example, street lighting, drainage and wider service costs such as Schools, dentists and doctors. Even with all the New homes bonus funds (if they were to go on infrastructure) and 106 agreement funds, the Infrastructure improvement costs would not be met without significant additional funding (touched on In the Cheadle Town Council Meeting 10<sup>th</sup> September 2018). Further contributions from developers will of course further increase house prices.

Historically affordable terrace/town housing provision has been available in our local City and the Potteries. There are currently at least 5 Properties across the Potteries available for less than £40,000. They are surely by any reasonable measure affordable. That fact alone would suggest that our region does not have a housing problem? Of course nationally that is not true.

The DCLG has clearly stated that it is for local communities to set the level of housing that they require, Indications are however [9][11] that S-o-T does wish to address it's significant Brownfield sites and address housing provision issues. While S-o-T is working hard to raise its image, it clearly still suffers from the collapse of the Renew Project in 2011. In addition to having extensive Brownfield site provision and being affordable, the City offers an effective and proven infrastructure (street layouts [10], Buses, Rail etc) for young couples to work in a bustling City. The problem Stoke has is an historic stigma that SMDC should help put right. Surely in an effective collaborative policy there should be a complete range of properties to suit all housing needs? By reaching Out to S-o-T, SMDC can clearly make a case for a shared affordable housing approach; including any identified genuine need for affordable local housing in the Moorlands.

**Issue:**

Without further details of Cross Authority collaboration it is not possible to define an effective affordable housing needs policy.

This is a very complex issue, however, taken in Isolation, SMDC are clearly failing and not compliant in providing a percentage of affordable housing distributed around the Moorlands.

**Session 6 - 13.30 Thursday 11 October 2018**  
**Matter 6**  
**Employment Policies (including town centres and tourism)**

Issues:

Cheadle Unite value the Town and its shops and facilities and encourage retention of its unique identity, not aspire to becoming another 'clone town'. The town work hard to make it an attractive tourist destination with the Pugin Church, Peak access, Nearby Alton towers, Foxfield railway to name a few. We do not want to see excessive housing provision that will further clog the very limited road infrastructure, the unique character of Cheadle and prevent tourism aspirations.

**Session 7 - 9.30 Friday 12 October 2018 Matter 7**  
**Generic Development Management Policies**

**Session 8 – 09.30 Tuesday 16 October 2018**  
**Matter 8 – Allocations**  
**Leek**

**Session 9 – 13.30 Tuesday 16 October 2018**  
**Matter 8 – Allocations**  
**Biddulph**

**Session 10 – 09.30 Wednesday 17 October 2018**  
**Matter 8 – Allocations**  
**Cheadle**

**Issues:**

The Housing Levels proposed for Cheadle are excessive.

The Planning Inspectors consideration on Matters 1, 2 & 3 has the potential to have significant impact on the Sites detailed below. Cheadle unite believes that:

- Brownfield Sites around S-o-T and Newcastle Councils must be a priority over any Greenfield Developments around Cheadle.
- Any Brownfield site developments around Cheadle must engage and consult with any affected parties
- Cheadle Unite is opposed to Greenfield and Agricultural site development in anything other than exceptional circumstances and where there is established genuine need.
- Infrastructure and road improvements must be compulsory not desirable and fully funded before any significant developments.
- Where there is any significant impact compensation must be offered to affected residents.

CU Would like to support the above positions on the day.

**Session 11 – 14.30 Wednesday 17 October 2018**  
**Matter 8 – Allocations**  
**Villages**

**Session 12 – 09.30 Friday 19 October 2018**  
**Matter 9**  
**Infrastructure, Planning Obligations and Delivery**

**Session 13 – 11.30 Friday 19 October 2018**  
**Matter 10**  
**Implementation and Monitoring**

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

Cheadle Unite would like the opportunity to come back on any matters discussed during the Hearings.

## References:

[1] Following Docs held by SMDC:

Consultation Statements 2015 and 2016 - Blue Folder 1,2 and 3

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Submission Version) Consultation Analysis Report - Light Green Ring Bound

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Submission Version Feb 2018

Dark Green Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Submission Version Summary Version Feb 2018

Dark Green Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Consultation Analysis Report (Preferred Options) Jan 2018

Sustainability Appraisal Blue File 1,2 and 3 (Huge Files)

5.2 Appendix 1 Summary of Responses File 3.1 Black

5.2 Appendix 1 Summary of Responses File 3.2 Black

Application For Neighbourhood Area Designation - Brown

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Submission Version Feb 2018

Information About Availability of Documents

Library Document List

[2] Cheadle Unite SCI Policy Response April 2014

[3] SCI - Adoption Statement Received 5 March 2015

[4] Cheadle Unite SCI Response 10th March 2015

[5] SCI Cabinet Report 2 12 14

[6] SCI email 27<sup>th</sup> March 2015

[7] Agenda Pack 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2015

[8] P001411 (William Cash)

[9] Cllr Sybil Ralphs Radio Stoke Audio (MP4)

[10] Stoke Brownfield Sites 2014

[11] FOI-EIR-SM0477

[12] Cheadle Traffic Congestion (No Road Works) 2014